

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Monday the 20th March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND VII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The amount of the grant for which I am moving, Sir, is 3·44 lakhs. It relates almost solely to His Excellency the Governor’s staff and household, particulars of which are given at page 6 of the list of Demands for Grants. This shows a small sum of Rs. 4,900 under ‘ 47. Miscellaneous,’ while the balance is all under ‘ 32. General Administration—Heads of Provinces.’ ”

Motion 333.

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—“ Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion :—

333. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures by Rs. 3,000.*

“ In making this motion, I am not unaware of the fact that His Excellency the Governor has made use of his pruning knife in several items. But here I find more provision made in this year’s budget than in any of the previous years. In 1919–20 the provision made for the same item of expenditure was Rs. 251, in 1920–21 it was Rs. 818 and in 1921–22 it was Rs. 800. This year I find it to be Rs. 3,800. If this item is provided in the budget with the idea of purchasing new pictures as was suggested by one of my hon. Friends Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar in the course of the Budget discussion last year for decorating the Government House, the residence of His Majesty’s representative, to furnish it with artistic pictures, then I must say that with this small sum the Government would not be able to purchase pictures of any artistic value. With these few words I move the resolution.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ We had a certain amount of discussion on a similar issue last year when Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar favoured us with his views. I do not think it is necessary to trouble him again for a further exposition on the subject of art. As I understand the issue raised, it is quite simple. With regard to the question whether there is any proposal to purchase new pictures, the answer I have to make is that this grant relates both to purchase of new pictures and to the maintenance of existing ones. You all know what pictures there are in the Government Houses and those of you who have any experience in dealing with oil paintings are aware what an amount of attention has to be bestowed on them every year. It is also the policy, and a right policy too, to add from time to time to the collection other pictures which are of special interest to the Presidency of Madras, for the additions are not made merely for the personal convenience of the Governor for the time being. I understand that an order has actually been placed in England to send out three new pictures of a definite historical interest to the Madras Presidency. These pictures are portraits of former Governors of Madras and they are expected to cost Rs. 1,000 each.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I have tabled a similar motion for amendment. It is not my object to cut short all pictures of value, but my proposition is this : that the Government should encourage Indian art and Indian pictures. Pictures of the famous Indian artists must

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

[20th March 1922]

also adorn the palace of His Excellency the Governor. I understand from the hon. the Home Member that orders have been placed with English firms for the purchase of three pictures. No doubt the three pictures will be very valuable as being the representations of previous Governors of Madras, but that will not satisfy the Indian aspiration or the Indian sentiment. My objection is that if this provision has really been made for the purchase of Indian pictures, I should certainly have voted for it, but having been informed that this provision is intended to augment the English productions, I have very great objection for going in for them, especially this year which is very lean and in which we are very hard pressed for money. So, Sir, with these remarks, I beg to support the amendment moved by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"There is one aspect of the matter which has not been touched upon till now and that is whether it is right to order for things for which there is no provision in the budget. If this is permitted, I am afraid we shall all be confronted with huge expenditure incurred without due sanction by the authority and we shall be compelled of course to give our sanction which otherwise we may or may not give. I think that aspect of the matter has to be borne in mind in the discussion of this question."

Rao Babadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"The fact that there was discussion upon questions affecting this particular point last year must have induced the hon. Members of the Government to take the sense of the House before including such items in the budget. We are somewhat handicapped now in the discussion of this item because we have been informed that orders have already been placed with a certain English firm and that those orders are likely to be executed. We will be somewhat unwilling, after orders have been placed, to ask the Government to omit this item altogether and thus place the Government in an embarrassing position. At least as a matter of future policy I would urge that before these items are sanctioned by the Council no orders should be placed for them. When orders have been placed, we find it difficult to vote for the deletion of the item. I feel it my duty to protest against the manner in which these orders have been placed for the pictures before the budget is sanctioned by the Council. If I do give my support, it is more as a sort of protest against the way in which money is being spent rather than against the expenditure of this small item."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I am afraid I cannot possibly subscribe to the proposition that the sanction of the Legislative Council is requisite for every little item of expenditure which may be incurred by the Government. The utmost that could be asked in regard to minor items is that they should be taken collectively to the notice of the Finance Committee. It is only important schemes which need be brought specifically before this Council, not items involving such an expenditure as Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000, the purpose of which is within the recognized policy of the Government. This particular item has further been objected to, not on the score of lack of previous sanction, but on the ground that it is incumbent upon the Government of Madras to encourage Indian art. How little bearing that issue has on this item will become quite plain if I give details of the three pictures which are being purchased. It was in October last that the Military Secretary brought to the notice of Government that three valuable old pictures of former Governors of Madras were in England and that the owners

20th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

had no objection to copies being made for use in the Banqueting Hall in Madras. Obviously it would have been absurd to send an Indian artist to England to make copies of these pictures. It has been ascertained that copies prepared in England will cost Rs. 1,000 each. The particular Governors whose portraits have now been ordered for are Streyンsham Master who was Governor of Madras from 1677 to 1681, Elihu Yale famed in the United States of America, who was Governor from 1687 to 1692, and either Thomas Pitt or George Morton Pitt, ancestors of the great Earl of Chatham and themselves Governors of Madras between 1698 and 1735. The action taken by Government was the result of this application from the Military Secretary acting under the instructions of His Excellency the Governor, who is most anxious that the portraits of these earlier Governors of Madras should be obtained for the purpose of completing the collection of pictures in Government House and the Banqueting Hall. A letter was addressed to the Under Secretary of State requesting him to arrange for the copying of these portraits, and I feel confident that if this proposal had been put before the Finance Committee, the reasonableness of the action taken would at once have been recognized. I cannot subscribe to the proposition that every little detail should be specifically brought before the Finance Committee. This item appeared as part of the budget which was laid before them, and if any member had required further information, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter would have given him the information which I have now supplied."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, the hon. the Home Member has stated that he was unable to subscribe to 11-15 a.m. the view that the sanction of this Council should be obtained for all items of expenditure. I may say, Sir, that we are equally unable to subscribe to the statement that he has made on behalf of the Government.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“My statement, Sir, had no reference to the powers of the Council; it was an exposition of the policy of the Government in respect of soliciting specific sanction for items of detailed expenditure.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I do not see much difference between the statement just now made and that previously made. All that we are concerned with is whether as a matter of policy the Government are entitled to incur expenditure in anticipation of formal sanction by this Council. Of course the hon. the Home Member may say that he placed it before the Finance Committee.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I did not say so.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“Or he may say that it was included in the budget placed before the Finance Committee. And therefore it comes to this, that neither the Finance Committee nor this Council applied its mind to this particular item, and the fact that it was included in a budget which was placed before the Finance Committee could never be considered to be a sanction. However, Sir, I join my friend in the protest that he has made that notwithstanding our best efforts, expenditure which, though small in itself, was incurred in anticipation of sanction. There is absolutely no reason why the hon. Member should not have moved a supplementary demand for grant. In fact, when this matter was discussed among some friends of mine, I told them that the expenditure must have been already incurred and my prophecy has been fulfilled. With regard to

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu] [20th March 1922]

the merits of the question, I do not want to say anything. I understand from the statement made by the hon. the Home Member that these pictures were about to come to India for presentation to the Government of India, and now there is to be a purchase. While I do not object to the benefit which this Presidency is likely to derive from the portraits of Yale and Pitt, two of the earlier Governors of Madras, in that they will go to maintain continuity in the Government House, I object to it on the principle that has been spoken to by many members, and that principle is 'let the sanction of this Council be previously obtained.' I am perfectly certain that this Council is otherwise not an unreasonable body. That is all that we are praying for, and I trust the hon. the Home Member will see our exact standpoint."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—" It occurs to me, Sir, that much time and energy has been spent on a small matter like this, time and energy worthy of a better cause. Here is an item of Rs. 3,800 of which Rs. 3,000 is sought to be reduced. It is for pictures in the Government House. And now we are told that we should not have begun to purchase these pictures without the sanction of this House; secondly, we are told that we ought not to go in for pictures by English artists; and thirdly, we are told that all these things should be placed before the Council at every stage. If hon. Members would kindly bear in mind that Government House is after all their House and the House of this country in which the Governor for the time being is more or less a guest, and if they would remember that Government House should be worthy, as was said in this House formerly by my friend Mr. Arpudaswami Udaiyar, of our country, and if they will also have some confidence in the administrative section of the Council, certainly such small matters as this need not have been pressed in discussion. With these words, I hope my hon. Friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai will not press his motion."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—" Mr. President, when I tabled this motion I did not know what the item was really for. If it was for the purchase of pictures, I thought that it was a very paltry sum considering the importance of Government House. Now I learn from the hon. the Home Member that the purchases have been made. But the Government relies too much on the Finance Committee and other members are not aware of what is left to the Finance Committee to decide. The Committee is more or less a secret bureau, which does not give out what has taken place therein, and we are all in the dark. Unless we know what goes on in the Finance Committee, we are not in a position to know whether these items are really required or not. With these few words and because as the hon. the Minister has remarked, we do not grudge to give our vote for even double or treble the amount. just as the Legislative Assembly without a word of protest voted Rs. 60,000 for the Right Hon. Srinivasa Sastri for his expenses in connexion with his trip to New Zealand and Australia, I don't want to press my motion. As for pictures for the Government House, if new ones are to be purchased, I am prepared to vote even Rs. 10,000, but the fact is we did not know what kind of purchase was going to be made. With these few words, I request permission to withdraw my motion."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" Before formal leave is given to withdraw this motion, I should like just to say, Sir, that I find, on reference to the file of papers in regard to this matter, that the letter addressed to the

20th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

Under Secretary of State to make this purchase and arrange for copies of these pictures was actually despatched on the 15th February last and specially mentioned that a sum of Rs. 3,000 on this account would accordingly be put before the Legislative Council. If, therefore, the Legislative Council now wish to disallow the purchase, it will be possible to cable to the Under Secretary of State and tell him that, if he has not already placed the order, the copies should not be made. I may add that the purchase and maintenance of pictures is a regular item in the budget."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Mr. President, from the speeches of hon. Members it is clear that the debate is not raised so much on account of the provision for the purchase of pictures. But from the statement of the hon. the Home Member it is clear that an order was sent without consulting either the Finance Committee or this House. I do object to sending orders when there is no budget provision for the same. It is cutting into the fundamental principles of a budget if an order is to be given without having made sufficient provision in the budget. The Government was at liberty even in the month of October, when the subject cropped up, to make their own reappropriations, and if they found that they were not able to meet the additional expenditure, they ought to have come forward with a supplementary demand for grant. If orders are to be placed without making sufficient provision or seeing that there is sufficient provision in the budget, I think all principles of preparation of the budget and the discussion thereof will be set at nought. The hon. the Minister for Development vehemently supported the opposition without seeing what was the real objection now raised from these benches. He ought to have seen the mere principle on which the opposition is made. It was because when there was no provision in the budget, when no intimation was given even to the Finance Committee, the pictures were ordered.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I should like to say one word with reference to what the hon. Member who has just spoken has said. He says that we ought to have come forward with a supplementary demand for grant. We could not possibly come forward with a supplementary demand for expenditure which is anticipated in the ensuing year. The only thing we could possibly come forward with is a resolution that the Government be authorized to incur the expenditure. But, if the Government is never to anticipate the passing of the budget on any single item, I submit that the administration will come to an absolute standstill on the 31st of March. If we can anticipate nothing that is going to happen ten days hence, and if we cannot make any preparation of any sort for the coming year without coming before the Council, I venture to think that the administration will come to a standstill. If the hon. Member who has just spoken will examine the procedure in England he will see that the voting of the budget goes on practically throughout the year, but the great bulk of the expenditure is incurred before the money is voted at all. The Government are only too anxious to consult the Council in every possible way and I venture to state that we place everything we possibly can before the Finance Committee and that their scrutiny of the items is a very rigid one and does not deserve the aspersions cast upon them. But I really think that the Council must allow us to anticipate the ordinary expenditure for the month of April and not to ask us to come before them for their specific sanction for every possible expenditure before an order is placed therefor.”

[20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ I wish to say one word with the permission of the House regarding the allegations made by my friend Mr. Tangavelu Pillai. I may tell my friend, as a Member of the Finance Committee, that we, the Members of the Finance Committee, are selected by this House and are creatures of this House. We are not a secret conclave and we have no right to be such. We have absolutely no right whatever to refuse any information regarding what takes place in the Finance Committee either to this House or any member thereof, and the Members of the Finance Committee do not pretend to be a secret conclave. I may tell my friend that he need have no apprehension whatever regarding anything that takes place in the Finance Committee and we are always quite ready to disclose anything that takes place there to any member of this House.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ In view of what has been said by more than one member in regard to the proceedings of the Finance Committee and in view of what I said myself the other day, that I hoped at a later stage to state how far hon. Members of this House would be in order in referring to the proceedings of the Finance Committee, I feel bound to draw the attention of hon. Members to the circumstances under which the Finance Committee was constituted. On the 1st April 1921 the hon. the Finance Member, Sir Charles Todhunter, moved the following resolution:—

‘ That this Council recommends to the Government that a Finance Committee of the Council be formed consisting of nine members, of whom six shall be elected by the Council in such manner as may be prescribed by the President and the other three shall be nominated by the Governor, one of whom shall be the Finance Member who shall be the Chairman of the Committee.’

“ That resolution was passed and in pursuance of that resolution the House proceeded on the 2nd April 1921 to the election of six members to the Finance Committee. In addressing the House on that day, I said—

‘ The hon. Mr. (now Sir Charles), Todhunter having moved on the 1st April 1921 with the assent of this House that this Council should recommend to the Government that a Finance Committee of the Council of nine members be formed at once, of whom six should be elected by the Council in such manner as may be prescribed by the President and the other three be nominated by the Governor, and the Government having accepted this recommendation, the Deputy President who presided over the proceedings on the 1st April 1921 directed that the election of six members be held in accordance with the regulations for election by means of the single transferable vote. Thereupon 26 members of this Council were nominated, and two of the nominees having withdrawn before election, the remaining 24 candidates were ballotted for at 5 p.m. on the 1st April 1921. The election was duly held by the Secretary as Returning Officer and the following six candidates were declared duly elected in accordance with the regulations for election by means of the single transferable vote: Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiar, Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar, Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar, Mr. Abbas Ali Khan, Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar and the Raja of Ramnad. In accordance with the resolution No. 17 passed at the meeting of the Council on 1st April 1921 and accepted by the Government, His Excellency the Governor has been pleased to nominate the following three persons to the Finance Committee: the hon. the Finance Member as Chairman, Mr. T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar and Dr. Gilbert Slater.’

“ It would be seen from this that the hon. Member Mr. Krishnan Nayar is right in claiming for the Finance Committee that it is an entirely subsidiary body or, as he put it somewhat forcibly, that it is a creature of the House. There can be no doubt that the hon. Member is perfectly in order in saying that. The Finance Committee has come into being because this House by a unanimous vote asked His Excellency the Governor to take steps to bring it into existence. Six members of the Committee have been elected by the House, and the other three members have been nominated by the Governor because the House had asked His Excellency to nominate

20th March 1922]

[The President]

them, and it is in accordance with the resolution of the House that the hon. the Finance Member happens to be the Chairman of that Committee.

“Under these circumstances to say that the Committee is a body
11-30 a.m. independent of the House, which is not amenable to the con-
trol of the House and all that, would be wholly out of order.

“Now proceeding to the next point, how far hon. Members of this House would be justified in referring to or quoting from the proceedings of the Finance Committee, there has been some discussion and I fear some misapprehension also. On the 17th November 1921 there was a reference to the proceedings of the Finance Committee and then, I think, it was with regard to some papers placed before the Finance Committee by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiar. Then Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar who sat on the opposition bench said—

‘Sir, I think, the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter is referring to a paper which has not been placed before the House. I think Government Members should not refer to papers which have not been made accessible to the Members of this House.’

“In reply, Sir Charles Todhunter said—

‘I submit that, if we are never to refer to anything that has not been placed before this House, that is placing a very large restriction upon our debates. In fact, it might involve the laying on the table any statute from which one proposes to quote. Again, I have been quoting somewhat extensively from an article in an English magazine. Does the hon. Member suggest that I should not be allowed to do that without placing the magazine upon the table?’

“Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao said—

‘May I draw your attention, Sir, to the ruling that you have already given on such matters? When the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson was quoting from papers which were not placed before this House and which were not communicated to the Members, and when I took objection, you ruled, Sir, that it was necessary for the purpose of debate for the Government to lay on the table of this House all the papers that may be referred to and that the Government had not the right to read from papers to which the Members had no access.’

“Then Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu interrupting said—

‘At the same time I brought to the notice of the hon. the President before the ruling was given on that day—as it is in the present case for instance—the hon. Member was only reading about what happened. It is not the case of a public paper or document that he is making use of. It is a paper containing the events of what had occurred in the Finance Committee. I do not know where the question of reading from a paper comes in.’

“Then I said—

‘I remember the ruling that I gave.’

“The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson then pointed out—

‘It was with regard to the Ayling Committee report, Sir. I accepted your ruling.’

“I then added—

‘Then the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson wanted to quote from the report of the Ayling Committee and objection was taken on the ground that the report had not been placed on the editors’ Table and that the hon. Members on the other side would be at a disadvantage. I then ruled that, that being a public document, it ought to have been placed on the table. The proceedings of the Finance Committee are practically proceedings of this House. If proceedings committees of this House could not be referred to in debates, then it would certainly lead to considerable inconvenience. I quite see that, whenever proceedings like that are passed, it would be to the advantage of the House if they are placed early on the table. I am not prepared to say that a Member of the Government should not quote from the proceedings of a Committee of this House. I presume that the proceedings have been printed and copies communicated to the Members of the Committee. It is open to the Members of the Committee to rely on them, and other hon. Members should insist on the proceedings being placed on the table.’

“This matter came up again on the 13th December. The point was again taken up and Mr. Krishnan Nayar said—

‘I want to say only one or two words on this resolution. There is no doubt whatever that everybody in this House, inclusive of the hon. the Finance Member, is extremely desirous of

[The President]

[20th March 1922]

effecting as much retrenchment as possible. The specific question, however, now before us is, whether we should pass this resolution recommending that a 20 per cent reduction of the expenditure should be carried out. The Finance Member has told us, Sir, that the Finance Committee is considering in detail the whole question of reduction of establishment as well as the reduction of expenditure in general. He has already quoted to the House certain figures showing how the strength of the establishment in different departments is sought to be reduced. I may also, Sir, supplement that information.'

"At that stage I rose to a point of order and asked—

'The hon. Member is presumably quoting from some public documents. Have they been placed on the table?'

"Mr. Krishnan Nayar went away from the point and said—

'I shall not quote, Sir. I may state, Sir, that the Finance Committee is considering the whole question and we have already come to the conclusion of effecting a retrenchment of about 71 lakhs of rupees spread over this year and the next year.'

"As a matter of fact, the point of order that I raised was not exactly as to what the Finance Committee did. But a document that was intended to be read from was not before the other hon. Members who were not Members of the Finance Committee and that I thought would be rather an invidious position.

"I shall now wind up. I am concerned only with the question of order. Whether it would not be convenient if the Finance Committee's proceedings are placed on the table is a matter I am not concerned with. If the Government considered that these proceedings should be placed on the table of the House, they might do so. If any hon. Member considers that these proceedings should be placed on the table, he has got his remedy of bringing in a resolution to that effect and getting it passed. It is a Committee appointed by the House and the Committee should obey the orders of the House. But so far as references to the Committee are concerned, I cannot prevent such references, and when any such reference comes up, it would be my duty to allow it. And I am not going to over-rule such references on the ground that the proceedings had not been placed on the table. Innumerable references have been made not only by the Government but also by other members who are members of the Committee to the proceedings of the Finance Committee, and I ask what the position would be if, the moment any such reference is made, I rule it as out of order. The whole position would be utterly untenable if I do that."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I ask you, Sir, to tell us what exactly is meant by proceedings of the Committee?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"That, I fear, I am not in a position to answer just now. That question would come up when the House resolves upon having the proceedings before it. What the Finance Member wants to know presumably is whether the term 'proceedings' includes all the discussions of the Committee, for instance, what *A* said, what *B* said, what *C* said, etc., and then the conclusions that were arrived at; or is it to mean only the considered conclusions of the Committee? As I have already said, that is a point to be carefully considered, and, if at any time the House wants my advice, I should be quite willing to give it. But that point does not now arise and I would rather not pass a ruling on that just at present."

"I shall now ask if the House permits motion 333 to be withdrawn."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

20th March 1922]

Motions 334 and 335.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

334. *To omit the provision of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

335. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,800 for purchase and maintenance of pictures by Rs. 3,000.*

Motion 336.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

336. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 83,490 for salaries of the personal staff of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 100.*

“My object in sending this motion has been two-fold. The first is to take this opportunity of thanking His Excellency for making considerable reductions so far as his personal staff is concerned. It has been said that some people who proclaim non-violent non-co-operation find that they alone follow it and not others. His Excellency was anxious that retrenchment should be made in every department to the extent of 20 per cent. But we are sorry to see that only His Excellency has acted up to that policy of retrenchment and in the other departments instead of a decrease there has been an increase of about 20 per cent.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“In my department there has been a decrease of 17.9 per cent.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I can claim a similar reduction in my department to the extent of 18.5 per cent.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“There is a reduction of one lakh in my department also, Sir.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“The only information is with regard to curtailment—”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I request the hon. Member to stick to the question of the salaries of the personal staff of His Excellency the Governor.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I was only referring to the general reductions. With regard to the Revenue Department, several posts under it last year have now gone to the other departments and therefore a reduction could be shown.

“Sir, I maintain that so far as the whole expenditure is concerned there has been an increase in the expenses by about 20 per cent.

“Coming to this particular item, I do not know if this was placed before the Finance Committee subject to any rules that have been made. I think that this House has got the right to override even the decision of the Finance Committee. Therefore, even if this matter had been put before the Finance Committee and even if we are told that the Finance Committee has passed a resolution accepting the item, I do not think we are debarred on that account from raising that point. So I wish to

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

say a few words on this. You will see that in the budget estimate for 1921-22 a sum of Rs. 47,040 was provided for and Rs. 83,490 for 1922-23. Then the question arises as to whether such an increase in the cost of the aides-de-camp to our popular Governor was necessary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I rise, Sir, to ask your ruling on a point of order. The item in issue is an entry of Rs. 83,490. The whole of that is non-votable with the exception of a sum of Rs. 3,840 provided for the Indian aide-de-camp and that provision is identical with the provision made for the same purpose last year. What I ask, Sir, is whether the hon. Member is in order in basing his criticisms on non-votable figures."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I noticed all that and I have therefore armed myself with an answer. The votable item is for Rs. 3,840, and therefore even if this motion to reduce it by Rs. 100 is pressed and carried, it will be perfectly in order."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. Member is in order when he proposes to reduce the amount of the votable item which is Rs. 3,840. Because there is scope for that reduction. I would add that he would have to confine himself to that Rs. 3,840; but he could not go on to discuss the non-votable items of one Major Rs. 10,800, four aides-de-camp Rs. 32,850, two aides-de-camp Rs. 27,600 and one Captain Rs. 8,400. These are items which could not be discussed; they are not before the House. The votable portion is only Rs. 3,840 and the hon. Member is perfectly in order in asking that Rs. 100 should be reduced from the sum of Rs. 3,840."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The hon. the Home Member said that we had nothing to do with the other things except that one item and that reference to everything else was quite irrelevant."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Does the hon. Member contest my ruling that he should confine himself to Rs. 3,840?"

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"No, Sir, no. I was only referring to the objection raised by the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. the Home Member raised a point of order which I have disposed of."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"All that I was saying is this. Last year the total amount budgeted for was Rs. 47,040, including this item of Rs. 3,840. For some reason or other the amount has been increased to Rs. 83,500 in the revised estimate. I was only asking whether it was necessary to have nine aides-de-camp whereas—"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"May I again ask if these references are in order?"

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"I think the hon. Member will be in order if he contends that, in view of the fact that His Excellency has eight aides-de-camp on the non-votable list, he can dispense with the one aide-de-camp on the votable list. If that is the point, he is in order."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Therefore, I am not satisfied whether this one aide-de-camp is also necessary or whether if this aide-de-camp is to get Rs. 100 less it will not be enough. All that I say is whether having had eight costly aides-de-camp it is necessary for His Excellency to have one more aide-de-camp on Rs. 3,840, or whether one on Rs. 3,740 will not do. To come to the whole question, Sir, last year, we

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

were told that in the previous years this particular expenditure came out of the Government of India and that according to the various recent arrangements made, this large expenditure had to be incurred by the Madras Government during the current year. Therefore, in view of the fact that an expenditure which was already being paid for by the Government of India was newly put for the Madras Government, I would ask if it is necessary under the circumstances to increase the charge for aides-de-camp. Of course, the usual non-co-operation may come in, but I would in anticipation of that objection submit that, so far as Their Excellencies are concerned, I do not think that any question of non-co-operation comes in, and, so far as anybody inside or outside this Council is concerned, it can be said without any fear of contradiction that Their Excellencies' popularity has increased during the year. Therefore, I submit that there is absolutely no necessity for nine aides-de-camp, unless the Government show exactly as to how the increase has been made and even in the non-votable items why the present number was not continued and whether there was any increase in their scale of pay. In that point of view and for the reason that I stated that there has been an increase under these two items of pictures and His Excellency's personal staff—I mean a general increase in these items, while there is a decrease under other items—and in view of the fact that there are a large number of aides-de-camp and that during the year the number has been increased, why should not an attempt be made by conversation with the Private Secretary to His Excellency as to any reduction in this particular item? I do not know whether we can expect any reduction in the course of the year or whether it will be increased without any reference to this Council."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I shall be happy to communicate a copy of the hon. Member's remarks to the Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor who will no doubt give them the consideration which they deserve. But I find it very difficult to reply to the criticisms upon which this motion is based without transgressing your ruling on the question of order. If I eliminate all consideration of items classed as non-votable, I can only refer to the single entry for the allowances given to the Indian aide-de-camp which as I have already remarked are identical with the allowances given to the same officer last year. If this House desires that His Excellency should not have an Indian aide-de-camp or if it wishes to take a hundred rupees from the salary of the Indian aide-de-camp, I do not imagine that the Government of Madras need raise any particular objection to the adoption of that course."

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU:—"Mr. President, if the House will pardon a personal reference, as the son of a military man I should deprecate any reduction under this head. There is only one Indian aide-de-camp to His Excellency the Governor and that his pay should be considered excessive is to my mind unthinkable. If at all I had the power to suggest it, I would urge upon this Council that his pay ought to be much higher because he is the only officer in the Indian army that is raised to that position. Therefore, I oppose this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I will only say a word or two. I think my friend Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu is unnecessarily alarmed about the pay of the Indian officer on His Excellency's staff. I do not think it is the intention of any hon. Member to reduce the pay of the Indian officer on His Excellency's staff."

[20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“If I understood the whole trend of the arguments of the hon. Member Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, it was for a reduction of Rs. 100 from the pay of that officer.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I understood it in a different way. It was for the purpose of bringing the matter to your ruling that he incidentally stated that it was quite possible that the pay might be reduced by Rs. 100. I do not think I should charge him with the deliberate intention of reducing the pay of an officer attached to His Excellency. But the point still remains, consistently with your ruling, whether it is open to any hon. Member of this House, without seeking to vote on a non-votable item, to obtain the explanation of the hon. the Home Member or the Finance Member for an increase in the number of these officers. That is exactly what I am now seeking to do. We find from the figures in the last year’s budget and in the present year’s budget that there is an increase in the number of military officers attached to His Excellency, and what we are now seeking to do is not to vote on those items but to know what is it that has led to this increase, and that is certainly within the four corners of your ruling. It is merely an explanation that we are seeking on these items. It is certainly open to His Excellency to table any item as votable or non-votable and this Council is not concerned at all with that matter, but at the same time I think it is due to the Council, this being one of those typical items, that it should know whether an explanation can be given by those responsible for the increase, and the general question has arisen, namely, whether this Council is entitled to have any explanation from those responsible for increases in this class of officers, and I trust the hon. the Home Member or the Finance Member will tell us why there has been this increase.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“With great respect to my hon. Friend whose knowledge of constitutional law we have been accustomed in this House to hear very often about, I do not think it is possible for any hon. Member to take advantage of a motion on a votable item to elicit information on a non-votable item. Let us take the case of the High Court Judges or the pay of the Advocate-General. There is the judicial administration which will shortly come before the House. Is it open to a member of this House to question the conduct of High Court Judges, or the salary of the High Court Judges, or the conduct of the Advocate-General, or his salary, under the guise of a debate on civil justice or anything of that kind? So on this non-votable item we are not entitled to question the propriety of increasing the pay of officers whose salaries are not voted.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I may draw the attention of my hon. Friend to the procedure that is adopted in the Legislative Assembly where the military budget is submitted for discussion though the whole of it is non-votable. The question of the distinction between the votable and non-votable items has been referred to and the view taken in the Assembly—”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“There is no diarchy there.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“My hon. Friend seems to think that in case of diarchy they can do anything.”

20th March 1922]

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“There is this difference. In diarchy many items are open for discussion by the Council whereas there the whole thing is left to the Government.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I have nothing to do with the diarchy for which my hon. Friend is responsible. My hon. Friends who are sitting opposite to me are responsible for the reserved portions. I am asking them why they have budgeted for more than last year. I think it is open to me to review it. Would you tell us whether we are to consent to any increased expenditure on non-votable items without absolutely any explanation at all ?”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“May I have your ruling, Sir, whether it is open to raise questions of policy of the 12 noon. appointment of an Indian aide-de-camp in discussing a motion for reduction of this kind ? Apart from reducing the votable item of Rs. 3,840 included in the total provision by Rs. 100 or by any figure, I wish to know whether it is not open to us to discuss the policy in regard to the position of the Indian aide-de-camp.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“That is what the House is doing and the hon. Member does not need my permission to discuss the policy underlying the motion for reduction.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“I may perhaps point out, Sir, that in the Assembly when the reduction of Rs. 100 in the pay of the second stenographer of His Excellency the Viceroy was moved the policy of His Excellency with reference to the present situation was discussed.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I believe the President of the Legislative Assembly did not consider that as the correct course. In any case hon. Members would be well-advised in understanding and applying our own rules thoroughly and not make too much of an attempt to follow what is being done elsewhere. The system that we are now working is different in different places. I am not giving it as a ruling but only as a matter of advice and I think it is probable that we may work out a better set of conventions by thoroughly understanding our own rules and standing orders and adapting them from time to time to suit our own needs. So far as this thing is concerned, there can be no doubt that this one hundred rupees reduction will have to come from the sum of Rs. 3,840. But the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao says that there is an increase under the non-votable items for which no explanation is forthcoming. As no explanation is forthcoming, what the hon. Member can do is to reduce from the votable portion. The hon. Member can certainly ask for an explanation for an increase in a non-votable item. The Government are not bound to give it but the effect of it may be that as they do not give a satisfactory explanation, the House may cut down the votable item which in this case is the Indian aide-de-camp. The hon. Member, Mr. Venkataratnam Nayudu, is perfectly right when he said that what we are going to vote upon is the reduction of the pay of the Indian aide-de-camp. There can be no doubt that that is the issue before the House. The hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu says that that is not the intention of the hon. Mover, but I am bound to add that what the House is going to vote upon is not the intention of the hon. Member but the motion on the paper, which is in this case to reduce Rs. 100 from that portion as is within the competence of the House to reduce, viz., Rs. 3,840.”

[20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, we are no doubt placed in an embarrassing position in coming to a definite conclusion upon the motion before the House. I wish to make a few remarks upon the policy underlying this particular appointment of the Indian aide-de-camp. I quite agree with the hon. Member Diwan Bahadur Venkataratnam Nayudu when he stated that it would certainly be undesirable to reduce the position of this particular officer or to reduce his pay when there is justification for increasing it. But what is more important in this connexion is the position in which the Indian aide-de-camp has been placed with reference to his pay and prospects. I wish to draw the attention of the Council to what appears at page 67 of the budget estimate. We find that so far as the Indian aide-de-camp is concerned, he is paid Rs. 170 plus Rs. 150, i.e., Rs. 320 either as pay plus an additional pay or pay plus an allowance. That is the position in which the Indian aide-de-camp is placed and there is the status and dignity attached to his position. In the case of other aides-de-camp, it is 700 plus 100, 900 plus 250, 950 plus 300, 750 plus 300 and the captain himself gets 700. Sir, I request this House to consider whether it is at all desirable to have an Indian aide-de-camp, whether it is justifiable to place him in this unfortunate and miserable predicament. He is given the dignity of an aide-de-camp, but considering his pay he is probably placed in the position of some one of the servants of the other aides-de-camp. That is a very undesirable position. Whatever we may do, I think, it is our duty to insist upon his position being made a little more attractive than it is at present. If it is not possible to place him in a higher position than at present, if it is not possible to place him in the same position as the other aides-de-camp, I do not think it is worth attaching any importance to his position.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to move that the question be now put.”

The closure was put and carried.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I beg to withdraw my motion.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Member cannot do so at this stage.”

The motion was put and negatived unanimously.

Motion 337.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

337. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,575 for purchase of horses by Rs. 3,000.*

“Sir, in the current year's budget a provision of Rs. 6,000 only has been made but we do not find any corresponding figure in the revised estimate. Apparently, the amount was not spent at all. In the budget year a provision of Rs. 9,575 has been made and that is really in excess over the previous provision by Rs. 3,575. I thought the six thousand rupees having been apparently not spent during the current year, the same amount was proposed to be spent next year. But I could not understand why a further sum of Rs. 3,575 has been provided for in excess. That is why I want this reduction.”

20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, it is difficult to trace out details like these at a moment's notice. But I understand Mr. Narasimhacharlu to surmise that there has been no expenditure under this item during the current year, because there is no entry against it in the revised estimate column. The answer to that, Sir, is probably to be found in the fact that details are not given under the several sub-heads of contingencies in the revised estimate figures. If, however, the hon. Member will refer to the total figure, he will observe that the revised estimate for 1921–22 contains an entry of Rs. 64,600 which is only Rs. 27 below the figure entered in the budget estimate for 1921–22. So it is a fair inference to draw that the Rs. 6,000 provided for the purchase of horses this year have not been spent. At the same time I cannot say off-hand exactly what amount was expended. Broadly speaking, the position is that the standard equipment of horses for His Excellency's Bodyguard is 72. The Military Secretary tells me that he regards the average working life of a horse is about ten years: that is to say, it is normally a question of purchasing some seven horses every year, and in any one year there may be extraordinary casualties necessitating larger purchases. It is therefore unsound to argue that in each year only Rs. 6,000 should be spent. The amount will vary from year to year according to the circumstances. There is another factor, namely, that the Bodyguard horses are purchased from the Army Remount Depot and there has been a recent increase in the standard scale of sale prices. Thus, the increase of Rs. 3,575 complained of depends on the Military Secretary's estimate of the number and cost of the horses which it will be necessary to purchase during the coming year. That estimate is regulated by the present condition of the horses now in the Bodyguard stables and must take into consideration the revised sale prices which have been laid down by the Army Remount Depot.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I think my position has become somewhat stronger now. If Rs 6,000 has been spent away and if it is proposed to spend Rs. 9,575 for the coming year, I fail to see any necessity for spending over and above the usual amount.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“May I ask, Sir, if the hon. Member has taken into consideration the possibility of several horses in the Bodyguard stables dying of epidemic disease?”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I am not a prophet like the military people.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I am not talking only of future deaths but equally of past deaths. It is not a question of prophesying.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“In the coming year we propose to spend Rs. 9,575 and the possibilities, I take it, will refer only to the coming year. I wish, Sir, some definite statement is made about it. If they die that is a fact which must be within the knowledge of the Government department. The hon. Member cannot give us any information that horses died in large number during the past year and therefore a larger expenditure has to be incurred and he is himself not in possession of the information. Has cannot ask us to assume that more horses died or became old or decrepit and so on. Even supposing a large number of them got disabled or cast away, they must have been sold not all of them could have been shot and there must have been some receipts and these must certainly cover a certain amount of the new purchase.”

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“The ordinary military procedure before pronouncing a horse to be unfit for further service is to convene a committee of competent persons including a veterinary officer to decide whether or not the horse is past service and should be cast. If it is cast, what happens as a rule is that it is sold by auction and the sale-proceeds are credited under the proper head; they are not taken as a deduction against charges. The hon. Mover has asked me to tell him specifically how many horses are wanted. From the present state of the stables of the Bodyguard, the Military Secretary, who is in charge of these matters, estimates that ten horses will be required next year. Seven of these horses represent the normal replacement for one year on the basis of a working life of ten years and a total number of 72 horses. But these are not the only horses to be replaced; there are also those which unexpectedly die or break down. Any prudent administrator of the Bodyguard stables would, I imagine, make provision for nine, ten, eleven or twelve according to the present condition of the horses in the stable.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Am I to understand then that this increase is slightly due to the rise in the prices considering also the period in which on an average horses are expected to die or become useless?”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“It is not merely a question of replacing horses which are cast in the usual course but also horses which unexpectedly die or become useless.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 338 to 340.

12-15 p.m. The following motions were not made :—

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

338. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 9,575 for purchase of horses.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

339. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 68,202 for contingencies by Rs. 4,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

340. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,10,500 for personal staff of His Excellency the Governor and His Excellency the Governor's Bodyguard by Rs. 40,000.*

Motion 341.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

341. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,020 for Government House furniture by Rs. 18,020.*

“Sir, in the year 1919-20 a sum of Rs. 1,30,000 had been provided for the Government House furniture, in the year 1920-21, Rs. 75,883 and in the year 1921-22, Rs. 55,000. That is to say, there was a provision of about Rs. 87,000 per year on an average for the Government House furniture. So by this time the Government House must be full of very useful, very nice and very beautiful furniture. Then again, Sir, for the year 1922-23, Rs. 20,020 has been provided for the Government House furniture. Last

20th March 1922]

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

year, Sir, when I made a similar motion, it was argued that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales was going to visit the Government House and that it ought to be fitted with up-to-date furniture. But now that His Royal Highness has come and left our shores, I see no reason why such a big amount should be provided in the budget."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, I quite agree with the hon. Member that there is no reason why such a big amount should be provided in the budget this year. But, if the hon. Member will refer to the same sets of figures, he will see that last year Rs. 55,000 was provided, and this year the provision is only Rs. 20,020."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"It is unnecessary, Sir, when during the last three years we had been providing for this purpose about Rs. 2,61,000, which comes on an average to Rs. 87,000 per year."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I imagine, Sir, that the hon. Member assumes that this money is spent entirely on new articles. That is not the case. It is required not only for the purchase of new articles, but also for the upkeep of the furniture to a very large value which is in use in all these Government Houses, including carpets, curtains, crockery, linen and many other kinds of equipment which are liable to annual depreciation and must be kept up to reasonable standards of serviceability. What really is germane to this issue is the fact that a reduction has been made in the amount originally asked for on the basis of a five-year average since the standard scale of furniture allowance for the Government Houses is fixed on the five-year tenure of the office of Governor. The normal annual sum on this calculation is, I understand, not in excess of Rs. 20,020. Moreover, during the past two years, the Secretary of State has specifically sanctioned an extra allowance of Rs. 30,000. This year we have reverted to the normal figure of Rs. 20,020, but I am informed that it is quite likely that a proposal will have to go forward to the Secretary of State to increase the figure. It has not yet gone forward, but the information before me is that it is practically impossible to carry on with the present grant and in consequence it is equally impossible to cut it down by even one anna."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"The hon. the Home Member has just now said that the Secretary of State had allowed a sum of Rs. 30,000 for each of the last two years. But I find from the budget that a sum of Rs. 75,883 was spent under this head in 1920-21, and that in the year 1921-22 a sum of Rs. 55,000 was provided in the budget estimate and the same figure appears under the revised estimate as well for that year. If, therefore, the Secretary of State had fixed a specific sum and these sums are apparently in excess over the amount provided by the Secretary of State, may I know if the Secretary of State has since sanctioned this excess expenditure?"

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"The answer to that enquiry, Sir, is that the Government of India have been addressed specifically to sanction the excess of Rs. 25,000 in the revised estimate figure over the budget provision of Rs. 30,000. I am not aware whether their reply has yet been received, but doubtless the excess was due to the exceptional provision which had to be made on account of the visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales."

[20th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Sir, I am not satisfied with the reply given, but anyhow, if the hon. the Home Member thinks that Rs. 20,020 is absolutely necessary to keep the furniture in good repair, I withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 342.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

342. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,53,450 for staff and household of His Excellency the Governor by Rs. 100.*

“Sir, in moving this reduction of Rs. 100, I just want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is no attempt made, so far as this department is concerned, to reduce the expenditure compared with what was provided for in the last year's budget. I thought, Sir, the general understanding was that we should, as far as possible, effect a saving of 25 per cent compared with the budget of the previous year. Judged by that standard, I find that whereas we provided in 1921–22 Rs. 1,68,500 for the personal staff of His Excellency, this year it is Rs. 2,10,500. Similarly under item after item we find that the necessary retrenchments have not been effected. Taking, for example, the Governor's Band, which I think is a votable item, I find that between 1917–18 and 1922–23 the amount spent has risen from Rs. 17,000 to Rs. 31,000 and odd. So also there are many other items in which I think retrenchment was possible, but has not been effected. I wish to know whether the rule regarding retrenchment by 25 per cent does not apply to this department.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“The ‘rule’ of *endeavouring* to reduce by 25 per cent may be held to apply, but whether it is possible in any particular case to apply it is a matter of fact. I presume that in this case it was not found to be possible, but I am afraid, Sir, I cannot undertake to trace back the history of the expenditure on the Band of His Excellency the Governor for a long period of years. All that I see before me at the present time is that the budget estimate for the particular item is Rs. 31,200, which is only Rs. 1,100 more than the revised estimate, and Rs. 350 more than the budget estimate for the current year. I cannot explain off-hand what the reason for these small increases is, but on the broad issue it is well worth remembering that the general tendency of prices has been to rise, and unless they fall it is not possible to reduce the outlay on particular items. I will take just one instance, the question of clothing for the bandsmen. That depends necessarily on the state of the market. If the price of the materials necessary for clothing comes down, a reduction is possible, but if the market rate goes up, no reduction is possible. And I cannot deal with the general issue of whether a reduction is possible on the whole vote, unless criticism is concentrated on particular items. So far as the whole vote is concerned, I would draw the attention of hon. Members to the fact that the total figure is Rs. 2,53,450, which is nearly Rs. 41,000 less than the revised estimate figure for 1921–22 and Rs. 50,000 less than the budget estimate.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“The revised estimated figure is due to the exceptional cause of the visit of the Prince of Wales, but I think

20th March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

the reduction was with reference to the budget of the year which is about to close. Anyhow, the hon. the Home Member has assured us that the principle of effecting economy by 25 per cent applied to this department as well, and I do not want to pursue it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 343.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

343. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,000 for tour expenses by Rs. 16,000.*

"Sir, for the year 1921-22 Rs. 41,000 was provided for special trains for His Excellency's own use, and Rs. 1,22,000 for haulage of his saloon carriages. Again, Sir, in the year 1922-23, in addition to Rs. 41,000 provided for special trains, another Rs. 45,000 is provided for haulage of saloon carriages. When the saloon was repaired only in the year 1921-22, I do not see why such a big amount is necessary for this year also. Again, Sir, now we have got our popular Ministers and Executive Councillors who go about all over the Presidency to get first-hand information. This being so, is there any necessity for His Excellency to go on tour as often as he used to do before? Formerly he was in charge of a particular portfolio and he had personally to go and visit particular places in order to get first-hand information. But now there are three popular Ministers and four Executive Councillors and they go on tour very often. But, as I have already said, since His Excellency is not now in charge of any portfolio at all, he need not go on tour as often as he used to do. If an occasion arises like the recent Mappilla rebellion in Malabar, or if he has to find out and know exactly about any big scheme which is in progress or under contemplation, there will of course be a necessity for His Excellency to go and inspect the places. Otherwise, there is no need at all. So, as a matter of economy, I am proposing to reduce the allotment by only Rs. 16,000."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I see, Sir, that the hon. the Mover has taken on to himself the mantle of our late talented colleague Mr. S. Srinivasa Ayyangar who last year stated in this House that when responsible government was spreading, he would not be prepared to support a policy of more touring by the head of the province. If, Sir, under the conditions which now obtain, it is the desire of this House that His Excellency should restrict his touring, I shall be happy to take steps to see that that desire is duly brought to the notice of His Excellency in order that he may give it the consideration which it deserves. That, Sir, will not, however, cover one class of tour which it is incumbent on His Excellency to undertake; I mean when he is summoned to Simla or Delhi for the purpose of conferring with His Excellency the Viceroy.

"There is one other factor which is in itself of importance and that is that the haulage charges on the railways will, I believe, from the 1st of April next be increased by something like 50 per cent. The information supplied when a specific enquiry about this was made by the Chief Secretary was to the effect that the excess would be about 50 per cent. I do not know, Sir, if the House desires me to go any further into the details of the matter. It is a perfectly simple issue.

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[20th March 1922]

“ The current year's allotment did not cover the full expenses incurred, largely for the reason that His Excellency had to go on tour 12-30 p.m. once to Simla, once to Calicut and once to Delhi. And it has been announced that for reasons of economy His Excellency has abandoned his usual April tour. That, Sir, is therefore sufficient evidence of the fact that His Excellency is fully alive to the necessity of economy. Another direction in which His Excellency has shown this feeling relates to his recent visit to Delhi when he and Sir George Lloyd shared a special train, thus reducing the charges from Bombay.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I am glad, Sir, to bear the statement made by the hon. the Home Member and it is but right, Sir, that the head of the province should set an example for all others to follow and I hope all the others will imitate the same. The only other thing, Sir, that strikes us as rather curious is that year after year the amount actually incurred under this head is always in excess of the provision made in the budget; for example in 1920 whereas the budget provision was Rs. 55,000 and odd the Government spent Rs. 84,000, in the year 1922 whereas the budget provision was for Rs. 80,000 the actual came up to Rs. 1,04,050. Last year the provision was for Rs 1,60,000 and that was not sufficient as it came up to Rs. 1,92,000. This year the provision is only for Rs. 86,000 and I only appeal that this amount is not exceeded as it was done in the last year.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ All that I wish to say is that His Excellency and the Military Secretary will do their best to keep themselves within the provision. But as it seems clear that the increased haulage charges will have to be met, and in view of the practical experience of this year the House must not be surprised if a supplementary grant is asked for later on.”

On the assurance given by the hon. the Home Member, Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao withdrew his motion by leave of the House.

Motion 344.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

344. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 86,000 for tour expenses by Rs. 100.*

Motion 345.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

345. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 344 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration by Rs. 100.*

“ This motion is one of those motions which are intended to elicit information and also to find out the intentions of Government in regard to certain matters now engaging the public attention. First of all I wish to know if there is any reduction of Executive Council members next year.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The four Members of the Executive Council do not come under this head.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Well, Sir, even then I should think that my enquiry is relevant under this head. I should

20th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

like to ask the hon. the Home Member whether it is the intention of the Government to give effect to the resolution of this House in regard to the reduction of the executive council members."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I must again, Sir, raise the point of order. The item, Executive Council, comes under the next demand. The details are given at page 7 of the printed list of demands for grants and I must decline to furnish any information at this stage, viz., on the discussion of a demand which relates only to the head of the province.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I believe this question is also relevant in this way. The head of the Province, I think, Sir, is also in a position to tell us whether the representations of this Council in regard to this matter have been acted upon though the item comes under a later head.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am by no means certain that the hon. Home Member can claim to be a special representative of His Excellency the Governor.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I make no such claim, Sir.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ This demand has a number of sub-heads. The whole demand is not in discussion now. It is only the head of General Administration.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I do not wish to pursue the matter. I will withdraw.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 346.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

346. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3·44 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration by Rs. 100.*

The motion that Government be granted a sum not exceeding 3·44 lakhs under Demand VII—General Administration was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VIII—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, I move for a grant not exceeding 2·95 lakhs for the Legislative Bodies and for the Translators' establishment in the Secretariat.”

Motion 347.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

347. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.*

“ My object in making this motion is not to reduce the rate of travelling allowance but to suggest to this Council whether instead of meeting every month it would not be more convenient to meet once in two months. At present, Sir, people coming from distant places like Malabar, Tinnevelly and

[Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan] [20th March 1922]

South Kanara in the south and Ganjam and Vizagapatam in the north are put to great inconvenience by distant travelling. The only people that are benefited by this are the railway companies. Therefore I wish to invite the House to consider whether meetings held once in two months or once in a quarter will not be more convenient. We should be saving some money also in the shape of travelling allowance if my suggestion is accepted. Of course we may have to sit for a longer period than we are now doing. I believe it would be better, distinctly better, to continue to sit for a week or ten days and finish all items on the agenda than to allow a very large portion of it to accumulate and lapse as at present. Having made this suggestion I leave it to the House to decide one way or other."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I have tabled a similar motion by which I really mean that the members of this Council should agree to take less than what they are claiming for their travelling allowance. At present each non-official member is treated as a first class officer and allowed double first class and a daily bat'a of ten rupees. These members, Sir, may perhaps be divided into two classes ; those who are of moderate means and those who are rich. The rich people would not very much mind, I think, the loss accruing to them by the proposal I am going to make, viz., that only a single first class fare and a third class fare for his servant be allowed for each member together with the usual daily allowance of Rs. 10. He would not be out of pocket in the sense that so far as actual expenses are concerned he is getting that amount out of the revenues. I think as regards the poorer people like myself, they need not be under any apprehension that they will be put to serious loss if they accept a single first class instead of a double first class. I do not know, Sir, if all of us really travel by first class and I think there are many of us who travel by the second. Personally, speaking for myself, I am constantly travelling to and fro and do considerable amount of touring in the interior and I think I shall be able to manage with a single first class and a third class. I hope the other members would see their way to accept my proposal.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I have given notice of a similar motion and I would beg the House to accept the suggestion made by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. Otherwise if we seek the double first class, the result will be that owing to the increase of fare that has already been announced our grant for the next year will have to be increased. Therefore in anticipation of that and generally considering the circumstances of the country and the necessity that we should set an example when we always cry for retrenchment, we should be satisfied with a lesser fare and follow the example so well set up by His Excellency the Governor. We see that his expenditure for travelling proposed for next year is less than half of what he has spent during the current year and two-thirds of what had been actually spent in the previous year. Therefore at a time when the railway charges have gone up so high and at a time when His Excellency is satisfied with half the past expenditure there is no reason why we should not accept the proposal of the hon. Member. It is but fair that we should show by so doing that even in matters affecting our own interest we are consistent and carry the motion. As for the exact amount we are not sure at present. Whether we shall be able to effect any reasonable curtailment or not there will be some curtailment if we accept the policy enunciated by Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. Therefore I have very great pleasure in supporting the motion.”

20th March 1922]

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I had no intention to take part in the debate on this motion. But having seen the turn which the debate takes, I am inclined to say one or two words. Two things have been urged before this House, Sir, in favour of carrying out this motion. The first is the one given by my friend and colleague from Malabar Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan. He said that there is no need to have meetings of this Council every month and that if we arrange to have meetings, say, once in a quarter or once in two months the amount of money required for travelling allowance will be reduced and that the House may therefore well adopt the suggestion of having fewer meetings.

“ Having stated his subject he left the decision regarding his suggestion to the Council. Apparently, he is not very keen about the change. 12-45 p.m. That is how I understood him. I am also not very keen on the subject. But at the same time, it seems to me probable that greater convenience will be served by adhering to the present practice of having meetings every month. If we have meetings every month we have the advantage and opportunity of bringing to the notice of the Council any matter of public importance, which may all on a sudden arise for consideration. For other purposes also, I think it will be more convenient to have meetings every month than to have them once in a quarter or so. If that was the only consideration, I would not have had taken part in this debate. But my hon. Friends who followed Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan have stated that their object in moving this motion is not to have a smaller number of meetings but to reduce the rate of travelling allowance.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I did not say anything about our having our meetings once in two months or once in a quarter. I am perfectly willing to do so. Even then there is no reason why the rate should not be reduced.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ With reference to the suggestion for reducing the rate of travelling allowance, I feel it my duty to tell the House that if this suggestion of my friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar be adopted, those gentlemen of this House who come particularly from distant mufassal stations are likely to suffer and will be out of pocket. No doubt Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar was perfectly right when he stated that the whole of the double first class fare is not necessary always. As a matter of fact, Sir, some of us, when we come from the mufassal to Madras for the purpose of attending the Council, bring with us our servants and cooks ; so that the double first class fare will just suffice to meet the expenditure of travelling single first class and the expenditure of our servants, inclusive of their railway fare as well as other expenditure necessary for our stay in Madras. Now, so long as we are to reside in Madras only for short periods, say for three or four days, ordinarily—though sometimes we are—we are not put to out-of-pocket expenditure, because the double first class fare that is given to us and the daily allowance will suffice for the trainage of the servants as well as other expenses that we have to incur. But when, as in the present month and in some other months, we have to stay in Madras for a pretty long period, then even the double first class fare and daily allowance are not enough for our expenditure. Of course I am not speaking for all the members. I am speaking for myself and probably for some other members also. Thus it will be a real hardship to the members if this double first class fare is reduced. For these reasons, I am afraid I must oppose this motion.”

[20th March 1922]

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—“Sir, I support the suggestion of the mover that instead of meeting once in a month, the meeting may be held once in two months and that only for a week, and not more than a week. As regards the rates, I oppose the suggestion. Of course, there may be members who travel in second class and third class and come without any servant and take meals in a hotel and find accommodation in friends' houses and so on. When there is a short interval some may also go home and return and make profit out of it. But others stay on spending money out of their pockets. For myself, instead of one first class I generally take two second class tickets and bring two servants and sometimes three, and many others do so. Without such convenience and comfort we won't be able to regularly attend these meetings. Again we are now and then obliged to stay on for a much longer time and spend a good deal of our time here. Unless the double first class rate is continued, it might drive out many people who have to come from long distances, as many of them, who are accustomed to live on my style might feel it very difficult to pull on.”

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“Mr. President, Sir, as a member who does not belong to the mufassal and one whom this motion will not affect if it is passed, I should just like to say a few words. I may say I have absolutely no hesitation in opposing this motion. Sir, with regard to our sittings I should like to say that the present arrangement seems to be the best. We are constantly in touch with the administrative machinery and it is now possible to pick out holes in it and bring it to the notice of the Government immediately. Sir, in the course of last year I think many motions for adjournment of this House were made and such things would not have been possible if we met once in two or three months. Therefore, I think that what we are now doing seems to be a healthy practice, that is, meeting every month. As regards the other question which has been raised by my friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar, I should like to say that the members from the mufassal are already undergoing sacrifices by way of the fact that they are all busy men and their business is affected by their coming here. Some are lawyers and some medical men. If this motion is accepted, it will be to penalize them for doing public work. If this is passed they would often be out of pocket. Though it is not going to affect me, I should say that this will work a hardship to the mufassal members, if these rates are cut down.”

Mr. AHMAD MIRAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“Mr. President, Sir, I beg leave to support this motion though I am unfortunately one of those who happen to come from remote quarters. In doing so, I should like to say a few words on the subject.

“It is our duty, Sir, to impress upon our electors, the poor ryots, that we are here to do our best for them by all possible means even by self-sacrificing to a certain extent at least. Though I quite agree that the present rate of allowance allotted for the non-official members of this House is hardly adequate to cover their actual expenditure, yet I cannot but say that the loss we sustain by the proposed reduction, i.e., by one first class and one third class fare for a servant, is not at all too much to bear, and it certainly matters very little when we compare it with the high and noble idea of self-sacrifice. Even that small loss can safely be avoided if we adopt the policy of cutting the coat according to the cloth.

20th March 1922]

[Mr. Ahmad Miran Sahib]

“Hon. Members are well aware that people in many places have already begun to complain at great length that we are here only to knock off money in the shape of travelling allowance and to increase the burden of the taxpayer by fresh taxation and so on. I, therefore, think that this is indeed an opportune moment for us to show our sympathy and sincerity towards poor brethren by translating our words into action. Further, it will cause no room for any one who is anxiously waiting for an opportunity to criticise that we are always crying for economy and retrenchment all round and we hesitate to effect economy in an item which touches our pockets and that too superficially. It is admittedly far from principle and reasonableness to persuade others to do what we are not prepared to do. Under these circumstances, I strongly appeal to the hon. Members of this House to see that the motion is unanimously carried by the House and thereby to set a good example for others—I mean official members—to follow it.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“Sir, we have been fighting with the executive part of the Government for the last three days to cut down expenditure in all directions. I am sorry we have not succeeded, but the tendency is there. It will ill-befit us, if we, at this stage, say that we should not ourselves be a party to that. Our hon. Friend Mr. Shanmukkham Pillai has informed us that he is himself travelling in second class, and I am sure many other hon. Members of this House are travelling in second class as well. Travelling in second class means that we can save about a third of what we are getting, and with this amount and with the daily allowance of Rs. 10 that we are getting here, we can fairly get on. Therefore, I do not see why any hon. Member should object to receive one first-class and one third-class fare.

“Coming to the number of meetings we are having, I have one or two words to say. I do not find any reason why so many meetings should be held in a year. To my recollection we have had about ten meetings last year. I would very much like that we should have only about six or seven meetings in a year and prolong the number of days of a meeting. It will be better for us if we have six or seven meetings and sit together for seven or eight days at a time instead of having a number of meetings and thus save a good deal of money. I believe we are spending about 15 or 16 thousand rupees every month on average for each meeting.

“Thirdly, I have to speak something regarding the hours of attendance. I am very sorry that we are kept here like school boys from 11 a.m. to 5-30 p.m. Thus when we return home we feel ourselves exhausted, and it takes two or three hours to recoup our original strength and vigour. Hardly any time is given for us to prepare ourselves before we come here the next day to discuss 70 or 80 motions, or even 100 motions sometimes. I therefore appeal to the House and to the Government and to you, Sir, to arrange the meetings in such a way that we can meet here at 2 p.m., and sit together till 7 p.m., so that we can have sufficient time to prepare ourselves on the motions which we have to discuss here. With these I appeal to the House once more to consider whether it is not desirable for us to show a spirit of self-sacrifice and to concede to the just proposal of my hon. Friend from Bellary.”

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, there are two aspects of the question which are presented to the House, the 1 p.m. first is as to the desirability of having meetings once in two months or three months instead of every month. I believe so far as that is

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [20th March 1922]

concerned, there is absolutely no room for difference of opinion if we pay due consideration to the question of effecting economy in the matter of expenditure. It is quite true that several of us from the mufassal may find it convenient if monthly meetings are arranged; but that is a matter of secondary importance when we realize that in the interests of economy and quick despatch of business, it is desirable that we should continue our meetings for longer periods and meet once in two months or three months. I am quite certain that the adoption of such a measure will entail economy to a considerable extent. Personal inconvenience apart, I request hon. Members of this Council to give due consideration to that aspect of the question.

"The second aspect which was presented to us was reduction in the scale of allowances. I give my whole-hearted support to the matter of reducing the scale of allowances, though subject to certain limitations to be kept in view. It is true, as my hon. Friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar pointed out, that if a man wishes to live well and make his own cooking arrangements and bring servants, he will certainly be out of pocket. But that ought not to be the criterion by which we ought to be guided in giving our assent to a motion of this description. I shall be very sorry indeed if the example which the Council is now called upon to set is not followed by the officials concerned. We have all along been asking for retrenchment in the matter of allowances to our officers, and we have not been so far successful in our attempts. We have only been promised some enquiry as a result of which there might be some retrenchment; but we are not quite sure to what extent reduction will be made in the scale of allowances. We are not sure whether the resolution passed by this Council to the effect that the Government should revert to the old scale of travelling allowance will be finally adopted by them or not. Consistently with our attitude and consistently with the position we have taken in asking that we should go back to the old scale of allowances, I think we should, as responsible persons, who have set the ball going, declare ourselves in favour of this motion and thus effect retrenchment in the allowances given to us. I am quite sure that some will suffer; but those who have taken it upon themselves to do public work must be prepared to sacrifice to some extent at least, if they are in a position to do so. If necessary, they must be prepared to reduce their style of living and reduce their daily expenditure. I think the other course is always open to them, if they want to choose between the two. Why I give my assent to-day to this motion is not because I am satisfied that the allowances are more than necessary; but it is because I feel that we must set an example. Let us try and see it done at least in the coming year. I am sure that Government officers who have all along been placed in exactly the same position as the Legislative Council Members will show the same spirit of self-sacrifice. When once they realize that the Legislative Council has been good enough, and the Government have been generous enough, in giving large increase of salaries, and when we once set the example in reducing this item of expenditure, I think our example would be followed by them. I am confident that this will lead to good results in not merely reducing Rs. 40,000 under the present head of travelling allowances of members but also several lakhs of rupees from other similar items."

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—"Sir, I beg to give my whole-hearted support to the motion. It is very good to sacrifice and work for the cause of the country."

20th March 1922] [Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai]

“ I may also mention that we have got to support our families ; and we are also responsible to the parties who engage us for cases. Therefore the question of running up and down from the mufassal to attend the meetings has to be considered. It is far better, I think, that we take the suggestion of the hon. Member Mr. Prabhakaran Tampan and see that we arrange meetings in alternate months. The meetings may continue for ten days at a time. With these few words, I heartily support this motion.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, three or four questions have been raised in connexion with this motion. One of these is the question of the duration of our meetings. I am not aware of the circumstances under which the present system of holding meetings every month has been fixed. I was absent in England at the time. I am certain that it must be on account of some representations made by hon. Members, whether official or non-official, that this system has been arranged. The question of fixing the time of meetings is, I venture to think, an essential one for consideration. At the same time I do feel that it is the general wish of many of the Members that the present system of holding meetings every month is inconvenient, and that meetings arranged for in alternate months would be much more agreeable to a large majority of us. So far as I am able to judge the present system dislocates the work of those who have to come from the mufassal. Therefore, if this motion is intended to raise that particular question, I venture to think that it cannot be properly solved by a vote under this head. All that has to be said has to be said and I am certain that you, Sir, as representing this House will do your best to devise some arrangement which would be convenient to the majority of members that come from the mufassal. Speaking for myself, I have no doubt whatever that meetings in alternate months would be much more convenient than the present system.

“ Sir, in regard to the subject of travelling allowances, hon. Members have been cutting down the travelling allowances of public services. The question has come up here more than once and so far as we are concerned, I do not think anybody will take us seriously unless we set an example of economy. On the question of the present scale of allowances, several hon. Members have already spoken and I think in the present stringent circumstances, one first class and one servant’s ticket ought to be considered enough. I believe in the committees appointed by the Government—the Andhra University Committee and the Education Committee—the members are paid only one first class. I do not see why that should not be adopted in the case of this Council also from the coming year. So far as the University is concerned, they generally give only one first class plus some supplementary allowance to cover extra charges. I know members are not quite pleased with the present scale and I also understand that a resolution has been brought forward in the Senate to enhance the scale of allowances. I think, Sir, that a first-class fare with Rs. 10 daily allowance and a servant’s ticket ought to be quite sufficient for us. I am aware, Sir, that a daily allowance of Rs. 10 is not ordinarily enough in Madras. It does not cover the cost of living and the charges for conveyance, which alone come to Rs. 6 or Rs. 7 *per diem*. On the whole, I think, Sir, that if some such adjustment is made, it would be convenient. I do not propose to deal with the question of hours of meeting raised by my hon. Friend Mr. Biswanath Das. It is a matter on which it is possible to have a divergence of opinion. Personally I would not like to sit later than 5 p.m. and I would like to get out for a

[Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu [20th March 1922

stroll after that hour. Therefore I am not prepared to subscribe to the statement that the sitting should continue from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. I think that would be most inconvenient. Therefore my point is, whether there is a change in the system of holding meetings or not, it will be conducive to economy if meetings are held in alternate months, the meetings continuing each time for ten days. Under these circumstances whatever may be the vote on this particular motion, I am quite sure of this that it would be much more convenient to have meetings in alternate months and it is necessary to reduce the allowances to one first-class fare and one servant's ticket."

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“Sir, as an official member of this House, I have no *locus standi* in speaking on this motion. But for that very reason I may perhaps claim to approach this question rather from a more impersonal point of view than some of the members who have so far addressed this House. This question of reduction in the expenditure on travelling allowances—which are necessitated by the fact that this Council sits once in a month and the members are expected to attend—has been approached from three different points of view. One, a very general question and one of great importance to the House, is whether a different arrangement can be made as to the sitting of the House so as to avoid very much travelling. That of course seems to me to be a question of the general convenience of the non-official members of the House, on which it might be very difficult indeed to obtain a concensus of opinion on an occasion like this. But I may perhaps venture to point out that there is one consideration which will have to be taken into account in any revision of the existing system and that is the preparation for the meetings of this House in order to ensure that all necessary material is put before it. It is placing a very heavy strain on the Secretariats and as to the question whether a new system in respect of the meetings of this House will necessitate any change in the working of the Secretariat, I may frankly say any addition to the expenditure on the Secretariat in order that it may adapt itself to the new system is one which will have to be taken into consideration. As regards the other direct means proposed for ensuring reduction in the expenditure, I may say that the Finance Department is very anxious to receive any assistance in any way to reduce the deficit. In England, many centuries ago, there was a system of what was called *benevolences*. They were generally called voluntary benevolences although those who contributed them were apt to regard them as of an obligatory nature. If however this House is prepared to place at the disposal of the Finance Department, benevolences—call them voluntary or call them obligatory,—I do not think the Finance Department would refuse them. The resolution, as it stands, shows one way by which such a benevolence can be affected. There is a certain amount of money which is provided in the budget for meeting the travelling allowances of members of this House. It is proposed to reduce that by Rs. 40,000. If that motion were carried, the balance at the disposal of the Legislative Council for the purpose of travelling allowances would be one lakh. If then sooner or later the expenditure amounts to one lakh, the Finance Department will be in a position to say that there is no more money and that any further travelling by mufassal members will have to be performed at their own expense or in the alternative, the Legislative Department will have to come to the Legislative Council for a supplementary grant. I may say that the Finance Department would have no reason to reject that solution of the difficulty, though I hardly think that this solution will

20th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

commend itself to the House. The real point that has been raised is the reduction of the scale of allowances and this has centred chiefly on the allowances that are granted to members when travelling by rail. No mention has been made of journeys by roads though I think there is quite a number who reside at considerable distances from railway centres. The daily allowances which are now granted are supposed to meet the expenses of the members on boarding, lodging and conveyance charges.

“Now, the question of travelling allowances is a very complicated one.

1-15 p.m. It has been under consideration in the Madras Presidency for the last three generations, I suppose. Apparently we

have never arrived at a solution which is satisfactory to everybody either to the Government or its officers or to this Council or to the members of this Council. Some say it is excessive, while others say it is inadequate. Apparently both views are represented in this Council so far as the non-official members are concerned. As regards the existing scale of two first-class fares, I may say that roughly taken it is a contract allowance. One first class is to pay for the ticket and the other for the various items of contingent expenditure. I am sure the Finance Department would disclaim any idea of wishing to effect retrenchments at the expense of the dignity or of the comfort of the non-official members of this Council. We do realize that it is not unreasonable considering that they place their services at the disposal of the State without any payment at all, that they should claim to be re-imbursed the out-of-pocket expenses which those services entail upon them. If any member is in a position to say ‘I am prepared to meet my own out-of-pocket expenses,’ well and good. It is open to him by refusing to accept travelling allowances, to give a *benevolence* voluntarily to the State. But the Finance Department does not consider it unreasonable that the comfort of the non-official members should be considered. They do not say that the non-official members should be able to walk from the station, should take their own tiffin carriers. It is not unreasonable that they should be refunded any charges for the carrying of baggage by railway or road.

“The only question is whether the existing allowances are necessary. May I say on this point that if we are to revert to the old scale of allowances which was preferred by one hon. Member as a desirable thing, then the allowances of the members of this Council, so far as I know, will not be affected. We regard the double first-class fare as contract allowance to cover all the incidental expenditure; it may be argued that it is too much in some cases. But the general idea in respect of travelling allowances is this: ‘What you make on the swings will be lost on the roundabouts.’ We do not in Finance propose to challenge the assumption that double first-class fare is a reasonable way of meeting all these incidental contingencies. But there is another consideration which involves more than the financial aspect. It is not the case that all the members of this House necessarily belong to the well-to-do classes. I think it would be a great pity from the point of view of this House if any impediment were placed in the way of able men whose means do not permit of them to make voluntary *benevolences* placing at the disposal of the State their services, or prevented them from seeking admission to this House. I think that is a consideration which ought to be borne in mind. There are members who can afford to place their time and money at the disposal of the State. But possibly there may be now, and I believe there will be more in future, members coming to this House who can afford to

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[20th March 1922]

place only their time at the disposal of the State, but not their money as well. I can only venture to point out from the point of view of the Finance Department that if any suggestion is made by which expenditure could be cut down, we would gladly accept such a subvention. But the Finance Department, I may repeat, does not wish to do anything or to urge anything which would interfere with the convenience or the comfort or place any undue financial strain on any member of this House, either present or future."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Probably it would be convenient to remember that we are discussing on this motion the question of the rates of travelling allowance, as well as the question of the periodicity of meetings. I cannot help thinking that hon. Members will not be able to dispose of the question of rates satisfactorily on a motion framed like this. The motion is simply this : ‘ To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.’ The reduction may be for any reason : it may be by reducing the rates. If I remember aright the question once came up before the House. I remember a resolution brought forward specifically for reducing the rates ; that is my recollection.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ It was moved by Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar to reduce the allotment for the travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 30,000. It was discussed on the 23rd March 1921.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ If any hon. Member feels that the time has come when the Members of the Legislative Council should be paid at lesser rates of travelling allowances, the most obvious course is for the hon. Member to give notice of a specific resolution recommending to His Excellency the Governor that in future the Members of this Council be paid at the lower rates. A division on such a motion will be a clear indication of the views of the House. On the other hand, in the present discussion it would not be possible for me, as the motion now stands, to put the specific question of rates to the House nor could any decision to reduce the allotment be taken as the desire of the majority of the hon. Members to reduce the rates of travelling allowance. I would therefore suggest—I do not put it wholly as a point of order—I would advise those hon. Members who are keen about reducing the rates of travelling allowance to bring that forward in the August meeting as a recommendation to the Government. Then the issue will be clear.

“ In regard to the periodicity of meetings I may at once say for the information of the hon. Member Mr. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu, that at the earlier meetings of this session when he was not here I took the trouble to ask a very large number of hon. Members as to the particular periods they would like to have—whether they preferred monthly meetings, or meetings in alternate months. I am, however, free to confess, from what I gather now, that though a large number of members preferred at one time monthly meetings, they have abated in their love for that system. (Laughter.) It would probably be convenient if one of the Ministers would tell us definitely what his views are in regard to the periods at which we can conveniently meet. That would give us a definite lead. I hope the senior Minister present here would do so.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ Mr. President, in obedience to your call I shall make a short statement. But, I have had no occasion to consult my hon. Colleagues. I assume that to a large extent

20th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

my opinion may also more or less very nearly square with that of my hon. Colleagues. On the question of the frequency of meetings, I do not suppose that Members of Government would like to have them at frequent intervals. It dislocates our work to a certain extent and very often the Secretariat is over-worked. At least for a week before the meetings we are unable to dispose of any papers because the whole Secretariat is more or less engaged in attending to the business of this Council, either in preparing answers to questions, or in collecting information for the answers. The proposal now made, that we might meet every alternate month seems to me—I am speaking for myself only—to be very reasonable. I really do not see any objection to it.

“I hope you will allow me to add one word about the motion for reduction. If hon. Members want it, they may bring in a resolution as suggested by you. I would deprecate all idea of the reduction of rates of travelling allowances. I would like hon. Members to travel comfortably, to live comfortably in Madras and vote comfortably, so that they may not be irritated when they are dealing with questions of importance. For one thing, it is very pleasant to work with them when they have travelled comfortably. The fare for a motor-car from the house to the Council Chamber is very high. As it is, most of the hon. Members must have been spending money out of their pockets. Therefore I deprecate any suggestion for the reduction of the travelling allowance.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“So far as the rates are concerned, of course it is open to hon. Members to say that they should or 1-30 p.m. should not be reduced. What I mean, is, if any hon. Member wants to reduce the rates, the appropriate course would be to bring forward a resolution to that effect. As regards the periodicity of meetings, however, it is a matter which has been engaging my consideration for the last three months. I have made inquiries, and the result of those inquiries very much tallies with what has been said by Mr. Ramachandra Rao and the hon. Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu, that as a beginning we may change the monthly meetings to meetings in alternate months. I would advise the House to try that. Let us try meetings in alternate months and see how that works. If that is the wish of the House I would certainly, when we begin the session in August, introduce the system of alternate monthly meetings. But pray remember that the volume of work to be done is the same whether you meet monthly or every alternate month, and hon. Members must be prepared to sit for longer periods at a time if they meet less frequently.

“I find that the average expenditure per monthly meeting comes to Rs. 18,000. We had eight meetings and the expenditure was 1·44 lakhs. This represents the expenditure to the end of February. The March meeting is generally the heaviest, extending practically throughout the month. That may raise the average. If therefore the hon. Members are agreed, as I see they are, that we should have meetings in alternate months, I will introduce that when we meet in August. So far as I am able to see from the figures put before me by the Secretary, you could effect a saving of about twenty thousand rupees for a certainty, if the Council meets in alternate months.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I propose, Sir, that Rs. 30,000 be substituted for Rs. 40,000.”

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“May I know whether by the holding of meetings in alternate months, all the work that accrues during

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu] [20th March 1922]

the two months will be disposed of in that meeting? As it is, when we are having monthly meetings, the work is allowed to accumulate. But if we sit for longer periods and finish the business without allowing it to accumulate, there is no objection to having Council meetings in alternate months."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“That will depend entirely on the House. If the hon. members want to sit continuously and finish all the work on the agenda, it is open to them to do so. So far as I can judge from the experience of the past, the House sits on an average about four days in a month; in the case of alternate monthly meetings the House would have to sit for eight days or so.

“I understand that there is a motion to amend this motion by substituting for the figure ‘Rs. 40,000’ the figure ‘Rs. 30,000.’”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The Government do not propose to reduce the rates. They will go on paying it so long as there is money. But if there is no money at a certain period, they will either stop the travelling allowance or come to the House for a supplementary grant.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“We all understand the situation. That being so, I will put to the hon. Members the motion, for the figure ‘Rupees 40,000’ to substitute ‘Rs. 30,000.’”

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“I withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The motion having been withdrawn, there is really no motion on the paper.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“What about my motion?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“Yours falls through because the main motion has been withdrawn.”

Motions 348 to 353.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

348. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.*

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB :—

349. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

350. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 40,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

351. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,40,000 for travelling allowance of non-official members by Rs. 10,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

352. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 10,000 for books for Council library by Rs. 5,000.*

20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

353. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,300 for shorthand reporters, typists and proof-readers.*

Motion 354.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

354. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 4,600 for deputation of the Secretary to the Council to Europe to study parliamentary procedure.*

“Mr. President, Sir, in the first place I must say that our Secretary is a very able man, and he is a great friend of mine. So any remarks that I may have to make just now have nothing to do with him personally.

“Sir, it is very often stated that the constitution that is prevalent in English Parliament would not suit Indian soil. When it is so, I do not see any reason why we should depute our Secretary to Europe to learn parliamentary procedure. Our election does not take place in the same way as parliamentary elections. The formation of the Government is not copied in the same way. There is diarchy here and there is no diarchy there. Again, Sir, the Government and Opposition here is formed not on any principle; it is formed on communal basis. And again, Sir, there is no ministerial party, because the party which belongs to the Ministers very often vote against themselves. So there is nothing to copy from the parliamentary procedure. Under the circumstances, there is no reason why we must waste this Rupees 4,600. Moreover, Sir, our three Ministers have had the advantage of having gone to England and learnt the parliamentary procedure there. Our President has gone twice, and our Leader of the Opposition has gone a number of times; and the Members of the Civil Service here who know much about parliamentary procedure can give us the benefit of their knowledge whenever necessary. Further there are books dealing with parliamentary procedure. Under those circumstances, I do not see any reason why we should depute our Secretary to go there. If at all this Council decides to send a man, it is but right that a younger man should be sent to England to learn the parliamentary procedure, so that his services may be useful to the Council for a longer time. My friend, our Secretary, is old, almost retired, and it is no use compelling him to go to England and undergo hardships there. With these words, I entirely leave the matter to the Council to decide whether we ought to depute our Secretary to England to learn the parliamentary procedure.”

Mr. ABBAS ALI :—“As one of the members of the Finance Committee I gave my support to the deputation. I now doubt whether the Secretary will be able to do any useful work now in England, as the general election will take place in June and the parliamentary business will be dislocated and he will not be able to learn anything because there will be no Parliament sitting. I ask whether it is not possible to postpone the deputation to next year or to some other time when the Parliament may be sitting. We see from the papers that fresh elections are expected in the months of May and June. I doubt very much whether Parliament would be sitting then. At that time, I think the members would be enjoying themselves in country places.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“Mr. President, several objections have been taken to this grant, one of them being that our constitution is not based on English lines, and there is no comparison between our conventions and the parliamentary conventions. We expect to be self-governing as

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.] [20th March 1922]

soon as possible. People in this House do not realise the importance of the Clerk of the House in England who is an authority on all matters of procedure, even assisting the Speaker and advising members on question of order and the proceedings of the House. Here, during the time that we have had Mr. Swamikannu Pillai as our Secretary, he has done splendid work for us and he will continue to do splendid work hereafter. (Loud applause.) There is no question of age here. We have found his services invaluable and I hope he will give us his services in future also. I understand that the President is going to England and it will be a great advantage for the Secretary to go along with the President as he will have more facilities for studying the English procedure than if he went by himself. (A Member: hear, hear). That is the reason why the Government after very great consideration have sanctioned this amount in order that our present Secretary may be much more useful than he is even now. It is no use saying we can study the procedure through books. I have tried to do it and I have failed. We have now standing orders for asking questions and eliciting answers. We copied it from the English practice, but on many matters of detail even to-day I do not get any guidance as to what the English practice is with regard to notice and other matters. The traditions of the House can only be developed by a capable Clerk of the House. That is why we propose this Rs. 4,600. I hope Mr. Swamikannu Pillai won't blush, as I had to recount to the House the invaluable services rendered by him."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“As a member of the Finance Committee, I wish to associate myself with everything that has been so forcibly said by my friend the hon. the Law Member. As already stated, the Clerk in the House of Commons is a very important officer. I may supplement his remarks by saying that the Secretary to this House corresponds to the Clerk in the House of Commons. The two greatest authorities that we have had on the question of the procedure of the House of Commons are persons who were Clerks of the House. The highest and the most respected and

1-45 p.m. acknowledged authority on the procedure of the House of Commons and a person whose authority was recognized by Speaker after Speaker and who was put always on committees which had to deal with procedure of the House of Commons was Sir E. May and his book on Parliamentary Procedure is even now a standard work. Then another person who was an authority and has written an introduction to a book on the procedure of the House of Commons was also a Clerk of the House of Commons. He retired only very recently and this House may remember that at the time of his retirement the House of Commons unanimously passed encomiums on him and I believe granted him a special pension. I refer to Sir C. Ilbert. These Clerks of the House of Commons were always of immense value to the Speaker in the Chair. So that, invaluable as the services of Mr. Swamikannu Pillai have been till now, I am sure they will be more invaluable hereafter after his return from England, after a study on the spot in the House of Commons of the procedure that is followed there.

“My friend Mr. Abbas Ali said that even if Mr. Swamikannu Pillai be sent now, it was not likely that he would have an opportunity to study the procedure in the House of Commons owing to the impending general election. So far, we have no authoritative statement regarding general election. For the last one year or so we have been reading about the impending general election and the general election has not yet come. We

20th March 1922]

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

do not know how long the existing Parliament will continue to sit and the Ministry may last. In any case, on this probable contingency of a general election taking place at the time of the Secretary's arrival in England we need not reject the certain advantage of getting the benefit of a study on the spot by Mr. Swamikannu Pillai of the procedure in the House of Commons.

“There was a suggestion that younger men should be sent for this purpose. I believe, God willing, that Mr. Swamikannu Pillai will be left to us for many more years. (Loud and continued applause) and it is certainly more advantageous to send him now than to send him a year hence, when he will be one year older (Applause). With these few words I have very great pleasure in requesting the House to reject this motion.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“If what I understand be true, Sir, that this amount has been disbursed from the current year's revenue, what is the good of providing for this sum in the budget for 1922-23?”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—“It has not been disbursed from the current year's revenue; otherwise we would have to come in for a supplementary grant.”

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—“Sir, I oppose this motion. I cannot understand on what ground Dr. Rama Rao told us that the western constitution was not suited for us.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—“I said, ‘it is said’.”

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR:—“If it is said so, it is a wrong notion. What is this Council for if you do not want the western constitution here? Let us go back then to our ancient system when the ‘king was everything and people were nothing.’ This constitution has been given to us as a step towards self-government. If we go back to our ancient system it would mean only autocracy and not democracy. So, Sir, it is better that we send our Secretary, who will give us the advantage of his age and experience, to England to study what is going on in the Parliament there so that he may rectify things here if need be.

“Moreover, as to his age, Sir, you are there as President much older than himself (Applause). You have beaten all past record and the whole Council agrees that we cannot get a better President than yourself (Loud and continued applause) Sir. Indian money is being spent for sending people all over the world—people who may or may not represent the democratic views of the country. Why should not this paltry amount be spent upon a gentleman whom we councillors here accept as an experienced and deserving man” (Applause.)?

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—“Sir, I am afraid that this motion has practically resolved itself into a debate on the respective ages of the President and of the Secretary. I think it is unnecessary to pursue this matter any further. I am certain that most hon. Members are agreed that Mr. Swamikannu Pillai is an experienced officer and that the experience which he will gain by his intended visit to England will be of great benefit in the working of the Council.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO:—“I agree with Mr. Ramachandra Rao in all that he said. I have the greatest admiration for Mr. Swamikannu Pillai. He has a gigantic intellect and he is one of the best Indians that was ever

[Mr. U. Rama Rao]

[20th March 1922]

born in this part of the Presidency. My remarks have nothing to do with his abilities. The only thing is, I thought, that at this juncture it was not wise to waste this money and if the Council thinks that this item is important I have no objection to withdraw my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Before allowing the hon. Mover to withdraw his motion I would like to convey the assurance to hon. Members that, as I hope to be in London for some time myself, it will be my endeavour to see that the House gets a full return for any money that it spends on the Secretary."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 355 and 356.

The following motions were not made :—

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—

355. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,41,900 for legislative bodies by Rs. 100.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

356. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,41,900 for legislative bodies by Rs. 75,000.*

Motion 357.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

357. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 59,000 for translators' department by Rs. 100.*

" My object in moving this reduction is to call the attention of the Government to the fact that Oriya does not find a place in their programme. There are translators for translating Legislative Council enactments, and various rules passed thereunder and also these translators are examiners of high grade officers for language examinations. They are also translating matters appearing in vernacular newspapers and furnishing accurate information to the Government. There are already four translators for all the languages except Oriya. Sir, this language is spoken by nearly two million or more people and I do not know the reason why the Government should not have an establishment for this vast population. I know that the translation work is being done at the Ganjam Collectorate, but the salary of the translator is such that accurate translations of things cannot be had from people who are drawing that salary and doing that work. I was once the victim of a translator in the Collectorate. He had mutilated my articles in the course of translation and placed them before the District Magistrate. As a result of this, I had several warnings for nothing from the District Magistrate. I suggest therefore that the Government should look to the wants of the Oriyas and see that a translators' department is established in Madras or better arrangements made in Ganjam. It is only to draw attention to this fact that I move for the reduction of Rs. 100."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I had no idea when I saw this resolution that the complaint was that we should increase the establishment of translators by adding to it an Oriya establishment. As

20th March 1922]

[Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

has been said by Mr. Rath himself, it has not been found necessary to have a permanent Oriya translator here for the purpose of translating any particular Oriya document. It may be, I do not know, that the articles which my friend referred to were not translated to his taste, especially if it was in colloquial Oriya or if it was difficult for the translators to understand. There is always difficulty in translating literature, not quite so much in translating enactments. Hitherto we have found no difficulty; we have had no complaints and we did not therefore think it necessary to increase the establishment of translators by having a separate Oriya translator. When the need is found, I dare say the Government will see their way to appoint a competent Oriya translator."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“I speak of mis-translations of articles from vernacular newspapers—”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“The Government have had no complaints whatsoever.”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“Very well. I say now that such articles are not properly translated and I draw the attention of the Government to that fact. Even the printing and translation of these things are not properly done. The translator is in Ganjam. The proofs are sent to him and much delay is caused. I have also had a talk with people connected with the Government Press and I found that there is great difficulty. It is a pity that the hon. the Law Member does not see the inconvenience now caused.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“May I say again that I have had no complaints at all?”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“I now make the complaint to the hon. the Law Member and if he will promise to look into the matter I will withdraw my motion.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I may enquire, but I cannot give any assurance. If there was any complaint, it ought to have come to us in the first instance instead of its taking the form of a motion to take away Rs. 100 from this allotment.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“I am very sorry that all the complaints and difficulties that the Oriya population are undergoing are hardly brought to the notice of the hon. Members of the Government or to this Council. The hon. the Law Member probably does not know how often the poor Telugu gentleman who is kept here to translate in the Dead Letter Office comes and worries the students of the Law College and post-graduate students to get his things translated. Probably he does not know what amount of trouble and difficulty the Oriya clients are undergoing who have the misfortune to come to the High Court.”

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I have nothing to do with the Oriya translator in the High Court or what a particular translator does for getting his work done. Whether he worries the students or worries himself, if the translation is good and I get it, I do not mind.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“My point is this : if you maintain an Oriya translator here, all these difficulties will be at an end. As for the point pressed by Mr. Rath, the hon. the Law Member must realise how difficult it is for a low-paid officer to translate laws and enactments. I shall

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

[20th March 1922]

be very sorry if any racial distinction is made in this motion. What I want to impress upon the Council is the needs of the people. If you wish to carry the people along with you, you should make all necessary provision for them. It will be an evil day, however, for the people and should I say also for the Government if you deny them the bare necessities, if you will not have for them a good translator to translate the laws and enactments that are passed in this House, to give them translations of the various communiques of the Government and lastly to give them translations of all that is desired by the Government to be published. I was very sorry to hear the hon. the Law

2 p.m. Member say that he had not received any complaints. I am also sorry, Sir, that people have not yet taken into their

heads to come to such a distance to make personal complaints and, if my information is correct, I am sure that the Oriya Samaj of Ganjam has time after time complained about this to the district collectors of Ganjam and has placed various representations before the Madras Government to have their grievances redressed. If the hon. Member would only look into the files, he will find that many complaints were sent and many representations made on this point."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"The previous speaker has said that complaints were made to the Madras Government. May I know when any complaint was made?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"If the hon. the Law Member would give me an opportunity, I will certainly tell him."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"In view of the unsatisfactory attitude of the hon. the Law Member, I do not want to press my motion, Sir, but I wish to have a resolution moved later on on the subject."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 2·95 lakhs under Demand VIII. General Administration—Legislative Bodies was put and carried.

The grant was made.

The House then adjourned for lunch at 2-3 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-50 p.m.

DEMAND IX—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 13·26 lakhs under the head IX. General Administration—Secretariat, etc."

Motion 358.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

358. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,604 for steno-typist clerks (reduction in the number from 5 to 3) by Rs. 3,500.*

"Sir, for making the line clear to begin with, and to avoid the risk of my intention being spoken to by others and myself not having an opportunity to say what my real intention is, I will just begin by saying what my real intention in making this motion is. This is one of those propositions where, in cases in which we cannot move any reduction in non-votable charges, we

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

make motions for reductions by way of censure or to get explanations of policy. I hope, Sir, under your rulings that would be perfectly in order. So far as this particular item is concerned, it is not at all my intention to get any reduction either in the number or in the pay of these poor steno-typists. I have raised this question specifically instead of raising the question of a reduction of Rs. 100 which would be vague. I have raised this specifically with a view to show that I want to get at one important question, namely, as to whether five would be always necessary even if the number of the Executive Councillors is reduced to three. My object was only to get a statement from the hon. Members of the Executive Council as to whether there is any idea of any reduction in their number. So far as the Ministers are concerned, each Minister has got only one typist."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I beg pardon, Sir ; I have got two."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"When I said typists, I meant steno-typists."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"I have got two steno-typists" (Laughter.)

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Very well, Sir ; all I can say is that there are only three steno-typists provided for in the budget for all the three Ministers."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"That is because, Sir, the clerk of Mr. Ramarayaningar is not a steno-typist."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"It may be there are other people who are clerks but who do the work of steno-typists. But so far as this Council is concerned, there are only three steno-typists according to the budget estimate for three Ministers. To come to the Members of the Executive Council five steno-typists are asked for. What I was going to say is, having regard to the policy of the Council in the light of its previous resolution regarding the reduction in the number of Members of the Executive Council from four to three, the necessity for even four steno-typists is not made out, not to speak of five steno-typists. It is a question of policy of the Executive Council. More especially, the elaborate statement of the hon. the Finance Member brushes the whole question of the Executive Council aside with only one or two lines, and it does not say anything as regards the policy of the Government on the question of the number of Members of the Executive Council. I read in the newspapers—I do not know if I may here refer to newspapers—a report on the matter, and that has not been contradicted by anybody including the Publicity Bureau. It is usual when any important statement is made in the newspapers, for the Publicity Bureau to contradict it if possible. But so far as this telegram is concerned—that is the telegram to the effect that it has been decided or practically decided to reduce the number of Executive Councillors from four to two in this Presidency—it has been published but has not yet been contradicted. And the resolution practically unanimously passed by this House was to the effect that the number should be reduced from four to three. I would not have mentioned it but for the fact that it has been authoritatively stated that one post at least would become vacant soon, if not two. Therefore it is very desirable to know as to what became of the correspondence on the points and

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

whether this resolution has been communicated and recommended to the Secretary of State. We do not want information as to whether the resolution passed by this Council was forwarded by the Government like the post office to the Secretary of State. What we want to know is whether this Government has recommended in favour of the resolution or against it, and whether there has been any further correspondence on the subject; we do not want to pry into any confidential correspondence so far as this matter is concerned. We know what the reduction of one in the number of Executive Councillors means. It means at least a saving of one lakh of rupees, taking their pay, travelling allowance, etc., and also the pay of the steno-typists. I think every Member of the Executive Council is responsible for a lakh of rupees. This motion is not due to unnecessary curiosity to elicit information. I specifically mention this point only with a view to have information about the future strength of the Executive Council, and if the explanation is satisfactory, I will withdraw my motion. It does not matter whether this proposition is voted against or withdrawn. My object is to elicit information straightly and directly from the Government as to whether any correspondence passed with their own recommendation one way or the other and whether any decision has been arrived at favourable to the resolution passed by this House, and whether these Councillors may have some hope if not to-day at least at no distant date in this year of having this number curtailed. With these few words, I beg to move this motion."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I am sorry that I am not in a position to give the hon. Member any further information on the subject because we are still awaiting orders on the letter which we sent to the Government of India."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I wanted, Sir, two pieces of information. One was as to what was the recommendation to the Government of India. If the hon. the Finance Member says it is confidential, we cannot say anything about it. If he says no decision is arrived at, or if no decision is likely to be arrived at soon, it may be useful. We now specifically want some information. It was expected very much to be mentioned in the Financial Statement but it has not been mentioned there. We request to know something about the purport of the correspondence that has gone on till now or the opinion of the Government or the Cabinet so as to enable us and the public at large to know about the matter. So far as the Ministers are concerned, our confidence in them is so great that we can very easily say that they will be prepared to take additional work, though owing to modesty they may say 'no'. We may tell them that they have no voice in this matter and that when one or two Executive Councillor's posts may become vacant, they should be prepared to take up more work. I appeal to the hon. Member to give us some more information if possible."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I regret that I am not in a position to disclose the contents of letters written to the Government of India, nor am I able to prophesy by what time the Secretary of State will pass orders thereon."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I hope that a publication of the Publicity Bureau will soon be out in the matter. I would like to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

20th March 1922]

Motions 359 to 362.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

359. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.*

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—

360. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

361. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.*

Mr. O. TANKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

362. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 7,500.*

Motion 363.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

363. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowances by Rs. 5000.*

“I will only say that the reduction will be very small and if the hon. Members of the Executive Council are only prepared to follow the example of His Excellency who seems to be giving up the special trains next year, this item of Rs. 5,000 could be saved. I would rather be glad to have their intentions than our compelling them to have them do anything. That will surely be a voluntary benevolent action on the part of the Government.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES THOMAS HUNTER :—“Sir, there is another aspect of what the hon. gentleman has called voluntary benevolent action on the part of the Government, namely, that it would involve voluntary failure on the part of the Members of Council to do their duties. There are few aspects of the reforms on which so much stress has been laid as upon the necessity for the official Members of the Government to be, as the Reforms Report puts it, more vocal and to tour the country and explain the reasons underlying Government policy and action. At the same time it was pointed out that the placing of non-official gentlemen in charge of Government departments would involve their touring in order to make themselves acquainted with the machinery of those departments. For various reasons it has not been possible to fulfil this part of the scheme. If, however, we may lay claim to benevolence on the score of failure to tour, I may take a good deal of credit on that account since I have been able to make only a single tour since the reforms when I went to Calcutta with my hon. Colleague, the Minister for Development, to represent the Madras Government at the meeting of the Associated Chambers of Commerce. There are numerous important schemes in connexion with harbour development which I know that I ought to inspect upon the spot, but the pressure of work at headquarters has been so great that I have up to now been unable to go out and look at them.

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

"I have one other thing to add and that is that the only tour which I have now in prospect is a visit to Simla in April and May to fight the battle of the contributions on behalf of the Council. This tour right across the plains of India at the hottest part of the hot weather is not a matter to which I look forward with any pleasure at all, and if the Council will by curtailing the allotment for travelling allowance make it impossible for me to undertake the trip, I for one shall be most grateful to them."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, there have been six motions included in the agenda for the curtailment of this item. Five of them for curtailing by Rs. 7,500 and the one moved by Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for curtailing by Rs. 5,000. I am inclined to support the motion of Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar for it is more modest and moderate than the rest. My chief reasons are that at the time of the presentation of the budget last year we definitely understood that attempts should be made to effect retrenchment in all possible directions. And we were also informed at the time of the presentation of the budget, that there will be a reduction in the travelling allowances. It will be found, however, that so far as the provision for travelling allowance of Executive Councillors is concerned, the provision in the budget was only Rs. 23,000 and it rose up to Rs. 35,000 in the revised estimate. I would ask whether in a year when effective attempts have been made and are also being made in the matter of effecting retrenchment in the travelling allowance, it is not right to expect that the Executive Councillors will also set an example by curtailing the expenditure on travelling allowances. We find that instead of a decrease as anticipated there is an increase in this year's provision. I think, Sir, the reduction of Rs. 5,000 over this year's budget provision would still provide for an increase of Rs. 2,000 over the provision in the budget for the current year. Supposing the Government accept this reduction and agree to have the figure at Rs. 25,000, even then if there is an emergency due to any unforeseen causes which necessitates an increase in expenditure, there would be no difficulty in making such a provision."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I clear up, Sir, what appears to be a misconception? There is no question of any allowance; the amount set down in the budget represents the actual expenditure and in the case of the railway companies it is paid to them direct on presentation of the requisitions given by the Members. There is therefore no question of being able to reduce the rates. The only thing that it is possible to do is for Members of Council, when they are travelling together, as for instance to Ootacamund, to share a saloon. This, I may say, is what my hon. Colleagues did when possible last year. But I don't think the Council can ask hon. Members to dispense with their saloons when they are going on longer tours. It must be remembered that we all have a great deal of work to do which has to be attended to in the carriage and it is not possible to do that unless some reserved accommodation is given. As regards the amount set down, it will be seen that the actual money spent in 1920-21 was Rs. 32,000 and the revised estimate for 1921-22 is Rs. 35,000. The provision for 1922-23 has to include a trip to Simla and back and therefore it seems likely that we shall have to ask for not less than Rs. 30,000, but possibly more. I do certainly think it is not possible to cut it lower and as I have already pointed out, we have no balances in hand from which we could

20th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

pay any supplementary grant that may be given and we cannot go up to the Government of India to borrow small sums from time to time to meet such grants."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I may once for all say that 3 p.m. it is not my intention when I ask for the curtailment in travelling allowance, to reduce travelling itself. But if it is a question of rates being reduced in the case of other people, in the case of the hon. Members of the Executive Council there is no reason why the system of doubling up is not pressed more and more and I do not see any difficulty why a reserved four-seated first-class compartment should not be used. The Member can get into it and work in the few hours when he is travelling.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ That is the usual practice, Sir.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I can understand the inconvenience in the case of long trips. But for short trips as for instance from Madras to Ootacamund, why should there be a saloon? Saloons cost much more than an ordinary four-seated compartment and I think in such carriages you can have all the conveniences. There is no great danger of any secrecy being violated. I do not want travelling itself to be cut. A good deal can be curtailed if saloons are given up. It is for the sake of the lean finances that His Excellency himself has been pleased to give up his special trains and he wants only a third of the last year's expenditure and there is no reason why the Council Members should not cut Rs. 5,000 by engaging a four-seated compartment instead of saloons. I leave the question to the hon. Members of the Executive Council and have no objection to withdraw the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 364.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

364. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 75,000.*

Motion 365.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

365. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,000 for circulation expenses by Rs. 2,000.*

“ Sir, I really do not understand the meaning of this item ‘Circulation expenses.’ Is it the peons that take round the boxes to the hon. Members' houses or what? Formerly we had three Executive Councillors and they never used to go to office. But now these gentlemen do come to office and do their work there from 11 in the morning to 5 p.m. And therefore I do not see why this amount is put here.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ This represents the cost of the contract for a motor van which goes round to the Government Press, the Secretariat, the Board of Revenue, Government House and the houses of Members and Ministers. I am sure I am speaking for the rest of the Government also when I say that we should be glad to do the work between 11 and 5. Instead we are liable at all hours to receive special files and papers with

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

blue labels, which means that they must be taken up at once whatever we are doing and we must have transport for this. When we called for tenders there was only one tender and even this amount, I am afraid, will be raised owing to the increased taxation on motors and increased cost of petrol. The Director of Office Systems is examining the question whether anything can be done to reduce the amount. I am therefore unable to see how the amount can be reduced. It is more likely it may have to be increased."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 366.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

366. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200 for Executive Council by Re. 1.*

"I am very sorry I have to move a motion for the very purpose for which my hon. Friend Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar tabled his motion. I repeat,—"

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the purport of his motion is the same as No. 358? In that case I apply for a ruling whether it is in order."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"There is something more than that I am just going to say if only the hon. Member had waited. I must repeat my sorrow again for the hon. the Finance Member having treated the subject very lightly and did not give us any definite answer or at least did not promise us to communicate the proceedings showing the intense feeling of the House on the subject."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"The House is in possession of its own proceedings."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What the hon. Member wants is that the wish of the House should be communicated to the Secretary of State. I believe it has been done and the hon. the Finance Member has said so."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"In this connexion it behoves on me to express that we are not only anxious that the 3-15 p.m. strength of the Executive Councillors should be reduced, but that we have also to say that their pay be curtailed."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Order, order. Do I understand the reduction of Re. 1 to be intended either to reduce the strength of the Executive Councillors or to reduce their pay? Is that the hon. Member's idea?"

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—"I want that we should have an opportunity of discussing the whole subject."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member intends by his one rupee reduction of the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200, which is the total of the votable and non-votable items that a reduction should be made in the number of Executive Councillors by reducing the cadre or that their salary should be reduced. Is not that the point?"

20th March 1922]

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“ My point is that we shall reduce Re. 1 from that item of grant on which this Council has got the power to do, and in so doing we shall have an opportunity of expressing the desire of the House as to the desirability of having four Executive Councillors and also the desirability of paying them the maximum of salary that has been paid under Schedule II of the Act. Further we would inform them that unless any undertaking is given we shall reduce a rupee from votable items as a sense of our disapproval.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ I fear the hon. Member is out of order. The previous motion was different, where the hon. Member Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar proposed to reduce the staff of steno-typists from 5 to 3. He was in order for this reason. His point was that ‘if the strength of the Executive Councillors was going to be reduced from 4 to 3 (as he believed it was going to be) then there was no need for five steno-typists’. That was why I permitted discussion on that point. Apparently the hon. Member’s point is by reduction of Re. 1 under this total head to bring about a reduction in the number of the Executive Councillors from 4 to 3 or in their pay. That is the hon. Member’s point.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“ My point is, we shall reduce the total grant by Re. 1 from those items in which the Council has got the power to do so unless the Government give us an undertaking to respect our wishes. Such an occasion only gives this Council an opportunity of discussing the whole question and expressing our opinion on its various aspects. It being a question of total grant, I would much like to know whether this Council has got the chance of discussing this question on an occasion like this. I shall certainly submit to your ruling.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“ The hon. Member is putting me into some difficulty. The total grant is made up of votable and non-votable items. The hon. Member admitted a few minutes after he began to speak that his motion was intended to reduce the strength of the Executive Council. How by reducing by Re. 1 the budget allotment, he aims at attaining his object, is a matter with which I have nothing to do. Why I am objecting to is on the ground of principle; the whole budget is classified into votable and non-votable items. The votable grants are entirely at the disposal of hon. Members and a certain time is allotted for them. If hon. Members, instead of distributing that time over the votable items, are going to spend it in dealing with non-votable items, in regard to which their decision really cannot be final, what I say is that their efforts will get dissipated in directions which cannot be fruitful, and as a result I think the best interests of the House would suffer. That is my point. I rather fear that if this principle which the hon. Member has enunciated, namely, that by proposing a small reduction in the total of any grant he could take power to discuss all the non-votable items in that grant, is agreed to in this instance, I fear it will lead to consequences somewhat far-reaching. I appeal to the hon. Member to consider that aspect.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—“ My point is this: that with due respect to your ruling I would just ask the House to reduce the total grant by one rupee on the ground that we have too many Executive Councillors and that their salaries are too high. We have expressed our disapprobation of

[20th March 1922

[Mr. Biswanath Das]

these and if the Government would not respect this I would ask the Council to reduce the allotment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I am much obliged to the hon. Member. The motion is to reduce the total grant of Rs. 3,22,000 by Re. 1 on the ground that the number of Executive Councillors is excessive and that their pay is too high. That is out of order."

The motion was therefore ruled out of order.

Motion 367.

Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu then wanted permission of the House to make the following motion which stood in the name of Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar who was not in his place when called out :—

367. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,22,200 for Executive Council by Rs. 1,28,000.*

The Council accorded the permission sought for.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" I ask for a ruling whether this motion is in order inasmuch as it purports to reduce the total allotment by more than the amount of the votable items."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu would see that the amount of Rs. 1,28,000 by which he wants to reduce the total allotment of Rs. 3,22,000 which includes a sum of Rs. 2,56,000 for the Members of the Council which is not votable is greater than the balance of Rs. 66,200 constituting the votable items which he seeks to reduce, so that the hon. Member's motion is entirely out of order."

The motion was therefore ruled out of order.

Motion 368.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—" My object in sending notice of this motion was to get information as to the number of Cabinet Members and their pay; but as the hon. the Finance Member refused to be drawn into it, I do not think any purpose will be served by moving this."

The following motion was not therefore made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

368. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,92,000 for salaries of Ministers by Rs. 48,000.*

Motions 369 to 373.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. R. T. KESAVULU PILLAI :—

369. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for Council Secretaries by Rs. 100.*

Mr. M. C. RAJA :—

370. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,000 for Council Secretaries by Rs. 9,000.*

20th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

371. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for the travelling allowance of Ministers by Rs. 10,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

372. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,000 for travelling allowance of Ministers by Rs. 4,000.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

373. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,300 for circulation expenses by Rs. 1,300.*

Motion 374.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

374. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,51,900 for Ministers by Rs. 100.*

“I think, Sir, more than one reason can be adduced for this proposition. I expected that the previous motions would come for discussion so that I might confine myself only to such of the points as had not been discussed by them. But inasmuch as the previous resolutions have not been moved, I think I have to change my plan. I think, Sir, the number of appointments on the Ministerial side is somewhat too many. I shall confine myself for the present to the appointments of Secretaries.”

“Now, Sir, each of these departments under the Ministers is assisted by no less than three Secretaries. The hon. the First Minister who is in charge of the Local Self-Government Department has an I.C.S. Secretary, an I.C.S. Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary of great experience, and I think he has also an assistant in the person of the Inspector of Local Boards and Municipalities though he goes by another name now. Similarly if you take the Second Minister, he has an I.C.S. Secretary, an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. The Minister for Education is similarly helped by an I.C.S. Secretary, an Under Secretary and an Assistant Secretary. It will be observed, Sir, that none of the Executive Council Members have got in addition to these any special Secretary as the Ministers have in the person of Council Secretaries. Now, it seems to me somewhat anomalous that if the work of the Ministers is not in any sense of the word larger than the work turned out by the Executive Council Members, they should indent upon the services of more officers than are absolutely necessary for them. Taking the Development Department particularly, which is after all an infant department, I do not see any reason why he should have so many as three Secretaries. The number of superintendents in his charge is certainly—”

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—“I rise to a point of order. The amount of Rs. 2,51,900 which my hon. Friend wants to reduce by Rs. 100 does not include the salaries of Secretaries. It includes only the salaries of Ministers and some clerks.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I am referring to the superfluity of the Council Secretaries. So I was referring to the establishment already existing with which he could certainly get on without the assistance of these extra people called ‘Council Secretaries’.”

[20th March 1922]

Mr. R. K. SHANMUKHAM CHETTIYAR :—“ My hon. Friend was not referring to the Council Secretaries, but he was referring to the permanent Secretaries of departments.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I understand the point to be that the Council Secretaries are unnecessary. He wants to prove it by showing that there are a number of people under other heads who could manage the whole thing without the assistance of these Council Secretaries. That is the point.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Yes, Sir. It so happens that what is clear to you is not clear to others. But anyhow, I think there will be no room for misunderstanding hereafter. Each of these departments has got three Secretaries, all people drawing very high salaries and of great experience, and there is no necessity for these Council Secretaries. After all what is the work that these Council Secretaries are doing? They are entirely concerned with the Legislative Department. That was

3-30 p.m. the reply given to me in answer to my question. I think they are not treated in a way that I for my part would like them to be. They have to be trained in the work, but they are not. They are not given any Secretariat work to do, and we cannot countenance the proposition that purely for Legislative Council work there should be three Council Secretaries. If they are given Secretariat work to do then we may contend that one of the other three official Secretaries is unnecessary. But so long as these three Council Secretaries do only nominal work under each of these Ministers and have no Secretariat work to do, I do not find any necessity for their appointment.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I hoped to refer to the Joint Committee’s Report, but unfortunately I have not got it before me to show that the duties which are expected of the Council Secretaries are of totally different category from those which are expected in the Secretariat. The Secretariat deals with the papers and puts them up for orders. The Council Secretaries have quite different duties corresponding to those of Parliamentary Under Secretaries in England. I do not think it is any use expecting them to take over part of the work of the ordinary Secretariat. It would create a great deal of confusion in the event of a change in the composition of the Ministry if the Council Secretaries were entrusted with the ordinary Secretariat functions. If one party went out and another came in, the Secretary of the department that is responsible for the administration would disappear with the party that went out. Thus a great deal of confusion would arise.”

Mr. T. SIVASANKARAM PILLAI :—“ The burden of our song has been all along retrenchment. In spite of so many motions tabled now we are not able to go a step further and we feel as if we are riding the Pecksniff’s horse always going to go but never going. This is one item where we can effect some sort of reduction. Under any financial system and more so in these days of deficit budgets, there are two principles to be kept in view. First is whether we can do without a particular item of expenditure, and whether we have money to pay for that. Judging the appointment of the Council Secretaries on these two elementary principles, even the hon. the Finance Member has not been able to enlighten us as to the actual necessity for these people. I would submit that if we could do without them, we must

20th March 1922] [Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai]

cut out the allotment from the budget. All this Government work was being performed before the Reforms came, by four Executive Councils and the staff that they had. Now we have three more Ministers who divide the work along with others and they have also their other secretaries, office secretaries and other establishments. We have had no information as to the nature of the work which the Council Secretaries are expected to do and are doing. No doubt the Government of India Act makes provision for the appointment of the secretaries. By all means if we can afford to have them we may but we are suffering from want and could not afford this luxury. The deficit is staring us in our face. In these circumstances it is absolutely necessary that we should adopt the principles above mentioned and see whether we cannot do without these secretaries. It is from this point of view that I support the motion."

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"I beg to oppose the motion for reduction. I cannot think that no case has been made out for the appointment of Council Secretaries. There is not the slightest need to defend particular secretaries to the Council and I oppose the reduction on the principles underlying the appointment. If it has found a place in the Government of India Act, it is because of the experience of England and other countries where they found it necessary to have for the Cabinet Ministers or people analogous to them Under Secretaries, here called Council Secretaries. In England though every department is properly organized, the Cabinet Minister at the head of each department is provided with a Parliamentary Secretary, an Under Secretary and so on. Further, the Ministry there has junior Lords of the Treasury who practically do the organizing work of the party inside and outside Parliament and the Secretary has very heavy official duties. Here they are trying to instal a new kind of political institution and the framers very wisely thought that some of the younger men belonging to the party in power should be given official training as insurance for the future of these institutions. It would be therefore highly unwise to abolish it."

The hon. Mr. P. RAMARAYANINGAR:—"Sir, I only wish to tell the hon. Members how indispensable the Council Secretaries are to the Ministers. Under the Reforms Act the position of the Ministers is unenviable. They are responsible to His Excellency the Governor and at the same time to the Legislative Council. This twofold responsibility more than doubles the Ministers' work. So far as the work connected with their responsibility to the Legislative Council is concerned it is shared between the Minister and the Council Secretary. So far as the ordinary routine office work is concerned the permanent secretary attends to it. Sir, in these circumstances it is absolutely necessary that there should be Council Secretaries to help the Ministers. As to the advantage of the appointment as a source of training to the future members, my friend, Mr. C. R. Reddi, has eloquently pointed out. In the course of events it is essential that young men should be trained so that they may be qualified to be Ministers in time to come. Sir, I do not think there is any force in the arguments advanced by the hon. Members from Bellary and Anantapur."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, all these days I was thinking of the conduct of the hon. Ministers and I was not able to find out the clue. To-day from the speech of the hon. Minister I am able

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [20th March 1922]

to find out the clue for so many failures on the part of the Ministry. The first thing is that they have got a double responsibility, responsibility to the Governor and responsibility to the elected members of the Legislative Council. I am not able to understand the first statement that they owe a responsibility to His Excellency. It is nowhere stated that the Ministers are responsible to His Excellency so far as I understand the constitution. His Excellency is to act with the advice of the hon. Ministers. The Ministers are to represent the views of their constituency or the views of their party but they do not owe any responsibility to His Excellency. His Excellency, as I said, has only to take the advice of the Ministers, to take it or refuse it. If the Governor takes the views, it is well and good. If he does not, it is for His Excellency to do away with the Minister or for the Minister to send in his resignation. If that is the correct principle as I understand it to be, I hope the hon. Ministers will not say that they are responsible to His Excellency at all."

Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB:—"I beg to oppose the motion. As has been pointed out by Mr. C. R. Reddi the object of this provision for the appointment of Council Secretaries in the Government of India Act is to afford a training ground for young members of the Legislative Council so that they may in course of time be able to deal with the big problems of administration. The Council Secretaries are now paid only Rs. 500 and my friend Dr. Subbarayan who was a Council Secretary till now was holding that office not for the salary attached to it but for the opportunity it afforded him in making himself quite at home with the problems of administration. As this is a healthy institution I oppose the motion for its abolition."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I am sorry, Sir, that the discussion has turned upon the existence or non-existence of the Council Secretaries upon this motion for a reduction of Rs. 100. I hear a voice from the opposite side: 'What else is there?' I would remind the Council that the appointment of Council secretaries costs us no more than Rs. 18,000. Even accepting this provision for secretaries, we can still vote upon the motion before us. The only point which has been raised by means of this motion is the whole appointment and establishment of the Ministers rather than any specific question intended to reduce the expenditure. We realize the difficulties under which the Ministers are labouring and the circumstances under which they work. The system itself is a peculiar one and it is in the course of experiment. We must therefore make full allowance for the various difficulties they have to work under, difficulties created by the situation itself. Now that we are discussing the budget the only aspect which I wish the House to consider is as to the feeling in the country, the feeling in this Council and the feeling of almost all the non-official members of this House that we should effect retrenchment in public expenditure to the utmost extent possible. I have not the slightest doubt that the Ministers themselves as representing the people and the tax-payers are in their own way as anxious as anyone else to reduce expenditure to the lowest possible extent so as to satisfy the people at large. But, Sir, notwithstanding the meagre attempts made during the last two or three days since we began the voting of grants, if notwithstanding the few attempts that we are going to make in the few days that yet remain to consider this matter, I am fairly certain that we are not likely to achieve

20th March 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

substantially good results in the way of effecting retrenchment of expenditure. The cry has gone all round that increase in expenditure began at the top without due consideration to the expenses of the whole machinery of administration. Retrenchment to a small extent has been effected here and there, be it in the matter of some duty allowances or be it in the matter of 2½ per cent in some branches like the forest; but we cannot satisfy the public at large by the results we are going to achieve. That is my impression even after making due allowance for the reductions that we are going to make even in the days to come. As I stated in the beginning, the hon. Ministers, I am quite confident, are equally anxious to reduce expenditure. But unfortunately owing to whatever reasons, they have not been able to show good results as they ought to have, even after we make full allowance for the difficulties of the situation, the voting upon grants which has been going on during these two or three days should have convinced every one that the complicated machinery which has led to a sort of, shall I say, combination or mutual understanding between one branch of Government and other has led to this state of things. May I draw the attention of the Council to some motions for reduction of the allotment of which notices had been given by, shall I call, the Ministerialist party, which it has been found necessary not to press to the extent they could or should have been, owing to the defects of the existing system? I frankly think that it is not due to any intention of the party to which the Ministers belong but that is due to the difficulties under which the Ministers are working. Sir, the chief difficulty is this. It has become necessary for one part of the Cabinet to co-operate with the other in various matters of administration. Their intentions apart, it has not been possible for them—probably the system is more to blame—to make reduction of grants or to press the reserved half of Government to make other reductions to the extent to which people at large, even their own constituents, would desire. This is largely responsible for our failure to effect retrenchment to a substantial extent, to the extent to which we would all desire. I may state at the same time that though the question of the Council Secretaries has been brought into prominence, it cannot be so much for the sake of expenditure that it costs us. I should say at once that the pay is far too little to be thought of. I never dreamt from the beginning of the Reformed Council that we would have Council Secretaries on a poor pay of Rs. 500. I must, in fairness, state that it should be with considerable degree of inconvenience that they must have consented to accept the office. But the hon. the Finance Member who gave us an idea of the work which the permanent secretaries have to do and the work of the Council Secretaries, has not been in a position to enlighten us as to whether, according to the original scheme of the Act, any specific duties, independent duties have been entrusted to the Council Secretaries on the lines on which the permanent Secretaries are expected to work."

(At this stage the time-limit was over and the bell was rung.)

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"A minute more and I have done."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I fear we will have to enforce the time-limits with some strictness."

The hon. Member, Mr. Krishna Rao, resumed his seat.

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“Mr. President, 3-45 p.m. the complaint of my hon. Friend from Nellore was that owing to certain circumstances, this Council has not been able to reduce substantially certain demands. May I respectfully submit, Sir, that the reason which he has given is not the correct one? The sole reason, at least the chief reason, was that the budget as prepared takes account only of our minimum requirements. Everything was cut down first by the departments, next by the ministers and members, then in that secret body, to call it by that name—it is no longer secret, Sir—the Finance Committee, and lastly in the Cabinet itself. That is the reason, Sir, why it is not possible for this House to cut it still further. And if my hon. Friend should think that members on this side of the House had abstained from cutting down the reserved side of the expenditure because they wanted to preserve harmony between the reserved half and the transferred half, then, Sir, I should say that it is a matter worthy of imitation by the other side. (Hear, hear.)

“Coming now, Sir, to the Council Secretaries and to the speeches of my friends from Bellary and Anantapur and from Vizagapatam and coming lastly to my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju, may I say, Sir, that he was deploring, or rather endeavouring to discover the reasons, why there should have been so many failures on the part of the ministers and what the reasons for these failures were? My hon. Friend was not able to tell us what the failures were, but he has discovered a reason and that is an admission from my hon. Friend that there is a double responsibility imposed on us, the responsibility we owe to His Excellency the Governor and that due to this Council, but my friend thinks that we owe no responsibility at all to His Excellency. I always thought, Sir, that next to my friend who comes from the same district as myself, my friend Mr. Narasimha Raju who comes from the neighbouring district was an authority on constitutional matters and that he was well versed in the provisions of the Government of India Act. But the Government of India Act and the rules framed thereunder make it clear that we are responsible to His Excellency. For one thing we can be dismissed by His Excellency. For another thing we cannot pass anything of importance without his consent, and I would draw his attention to section 52 of the Act.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“I have mentioned both these points, Sir, that His Excellency can dismiss them and also that His Excellency has to act in consultation with the ministers.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“If under the Act, His Excellency has more powers than those which my friend conceives of and, if we are in any sense to abide by his advice or his orders, then, I suppose, Sir, it is rightly called a responsibility. It may be that my hon. friend’s conception of responsibility is different from mine or that of my friends here; but I consider, Sir, that where we have to abide by the decision or yield to the wishes of a particular person, then a responsibility for doing so is imposed on us.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, I have already mentioned my interpretation of the Government of India Act. It is for His Excellency to act and it is for the ministers to advise His Excellency. According to the Act, the ministers by themselves have no independent right to act.”

20th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I very much doubt whether this general question about the constitution really arises on this motion regarding the need for Council Secretaries. I do not say that it is wholly out of order, I am not in a position to say that, but I would appeal to the House to consider that, if we are going to discuss the whole question about ministers on this small issue, it may not be able to finish within the time-limit.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ I bow to your ruling, Sir. I was only replying to my friends on the other side, but I will not pursue it further.

“ Coming next, Sir, to my friends from Bellary and Anantapur, I think a sufficient answer has been given to them both by my hon. Friend for the University and by my friend Mr. Ramarayananagar. If hon. Members would remember what I said on the occasion of the appointment of these Council Secretaries, these Council Secretaries are expected to do three things. The first is, as has already been mentioned by my hon. Friend for the University, their employment is educational, if I may use the expression, in that it is meant for training younger members of this House for higher responsibilities ; secondly, Sir, they help to keep the ministers in touch with the members of the House ; thirdly, they are expected to assist us in the discharge of our work connected with the Legislative Council. May I take this opportunity of mentioning to this House that in all these responsibilities our Council Secretaries have been of immense use to all of us ? (Hear, hear.) I may take this opportunity also, Sir, to mention in this House that I received equal help from my former Secretary, Dr. P. Subbarayan (Hear, hear), and if he has resigned, it was because his estate needed his presence urgently and not because of anything else or any other reason. Now, as regards the other Council Secretaries, Sir, we have been receiving from them such assistance as it was possible for them to render, or for us to receive. As for education, of course it is not for me to say how far they are being trained ; but this House, if not to-day, will one day own that they are in their proper places.”

Diwan Bahadur R. VENKATARATNAM NAYUDU :—“ I move that the question be now put.”

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

The main motion to reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,51,900 for Ministers by Rs. 100 was then put and lost.

Motion 375.

The next motion on the agenda stood in the name of Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar and it read as follows :—

375. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 91,620 for salaries by Rs. 100.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I put that motion, Sir, simply to call the attention of the House so far as the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar is concerned. His full pay seems to be non-votable and I do not know if I will be in order in moving this.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Ordinarily when a motion is in the agenda an hon. Member may go on, subject to some other hon. Member rising to a point of order.”

[20th March 1922]

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I rise to a point of order, Sir. The point of order is this : that if the hon. Member wishes to discuss the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar, the grant for that purpose is non-votable. I may add, Sir, that he never gave me any indication of his intention to do so.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I should like to know definitely what the point is that the hon. Member wants to raise in that motion.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, my intention was simply to call the attention of the House to the policy underlying the appointment of the Special Commissioner.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Then I do not think you can go on.”

The motion was not made.

Motion 376.

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPAN :—“ I beg to move the following :—

376. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,512 for establishment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs.*

“ Sir, my object in moving this reduction is not so much the omission of Rs. 1,512 as the abolition of the appointment of the Special Commissioner for Malabar. But that being a non-votable item, I thought a motion such as this would give the House an opportunity to express its opinion with regard to this appointment.

“ Sir, in November last, when Mr. Knapp was appointed Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs, there might have been so bad as to justify such an appointment. But now that things have quieted down and normal conditions have been restored, there is no need to continue the place and also in view of the fact that Mr. Knapp is reverting to the Executive Council when the hon. the Home Member retires, I would urge upon the Government not to appoint a new officer in his place as Special Commissioner for Malabar. What we want there is not a Special Commissioner, but two or three deputy tahsildars specially deputed for each taluk in the affected area, who will go round the villages, create a sort of confidence and sense of security among the villagers and find out the real wants of the people. They may also be authorized to receive applications for loans and suggest specific means for restoration and reconstruction. From what I have been able to gather, it is officers like this and not a Special Commissioner of the type of Mr. Knapp that we want. I therefore make this motion.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I think I may set the hon. Member's mind at rest by saying that there is no present intention of continuing the appointment. The only effect of carrying the resolution would be to deprive the Commissioner's staff of their pay till the end of March.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 377.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

377. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,512 for clerks and peons for Special Commissioner for Malabar Affairs.*

20th March 1922]

Motion 378.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, I beg to move the following :—

378. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,600 for an assistant secretary by Rs. 6,000.*

“ Sir, after having had no reduction at all from this morning, I expect to get some reduction now. This deals with the Finance Department. My motion is to reduce the allotment by Rs. 6,000. It may be to reduce the allotment from the two assistant secretaries by Rs. 6,000 from out of their pay. If we turn to page 72 of the budget, we will find that the appointment of the Finance Secretary is a non-votable item. Then comes an assistant secretary on Rs. 1,000—50—1,200 and another assistant secretary on Rs. 500, both of these being bracketted for Rs. 19,600. Then we have got a temporary additional assistant secretary, six superintendents and so on.

“ What I would say is that when we have got an able finance secretary and an able assistant secretary also and six superintendents to help him and an additional temporary assistant secretary at the time of the budget discussion, probably there is no need for another assistant secretary. Of course, if it is found necessary that temporary hands are essential, that might be provided for, I think, in ordinary circumstances either by the Cabinet itself or by the Finance Committee or by the individual members concerned. I do not think there will be any necessity hereafter for a large number of assistant secretaries to deal with every department, as the hon. the Finance Member says he does, throughout the year. Therefore, the reduction mentioned of taking away one assistant secretary out of the two permanent secretaries when there is already a provision for six superintendents to help them, is very small. It is the superintendents who practically do the whole work of the assistant secretaries. There is no necessity for duplicating these assistant secretaries throughout the year. Therefore, Sir, I think this small reduction can be made merely for the sake of reduction. I think the hon. the Finance Member will have no objection for taking away this six thousand rupees for this assistant secretary. So I move that the assistant secretary's post be abolished.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ I am afraid, Sir, that the speech of the hon. Mover of this resolution has come as a great disappointment to the Finance Department. There were two boons which we were anxiously waiting for at the hands of the hon. Members of this Council. One is that 'open sesame' which will open to us new methods and plans of getting wealth to supply our financial deficiencies. Next, Sir, we were anxiously waiting to hear from the hon. the Mover of this resolution a practical proposal, to enable us to reduce the work in the Finance Department so as to enable this resolution to be given effect to. But he said nothing from that point of view. He made no suggestions at all. If I may say so, the hon. Member reminded me of a gentleman—one Pharaoh—of whom we read as having given instructions that his subjects should be forced to make bricks without straw being supplied and saying, 'And the tale of the bricks which they did make heretofore ye shall lay upon them! Ye shall not diminish ought thereof; for they be idle.' Now, seriously I will ask the House if a motion of this kind ought to have been so lightly moved and dealt with in such a casual manner as it has been dealt with by the hon.

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

[20th March 1922]

Mover. I think the House realizes that under the reforms the position in respect of its business has very considerably altered. There is a new centre of gravity. The financial powers given to this House have very largely superseded other means of influencing the Government. The influence which in former days were attached to resolutions of the House is now attached to the discussion on financial issues and on the budget. The influence which this House exercised then was indirect. Under the reforms financial powers have become a direct weapon which they can wield as they wish. And that altered position has necessarily been reflected in the work of the department which deals with finance. There are further two committees of this House with which the Finance Department is directly concerned. The Public Accounts Committee has not yet got the work, but we are just closing the accounts of the first year and the Finance Department have to prepare for the work which is to be put before that committee. We have also during the last few months been dealing directly and almost daily with the Finance Committee, the members of which at least, though not all the members of the House, have the same knowledge and, I am sure, they realize the immense amount of work that has been thrown upon the Finance Department in connexion with the work of their committee. Such an amount of work was quite unknown before the reforms. Now, I think, I am entitled to say this that the credit of the Madras Finance Department stands very high in India and its work would challenge comparison with that of any provincial government and even with that of the Government of India itself (hear, hear). There is no province in which more particular care is taken to enforce financial standards, financial rules and financial procedure, and there is no province in India in which budgets have been more carefully and more accurately prepared. I have heard of that fact acknowledged by great authorities, from officers who have been with the Government of India and who are in a position to speak. Now, this year we were really at one time afraid in the Finance Department that we might have a set back and that we should fail to maintain that tradition and the reputation of the department. I can only say in connexion with the budget that we are now discussing that the work of the department was finished at 2-30 a.m. on the morning of the day on which the budget was presented to this House. I would add that the work in preparation for the budget broke down entirely for the time being the health of one of those assistant secretaries whom the hon. the Mover seeks to reduce, while another assistant secretary is already feeling the strain both mental and physical to such an extent that he is seriously thinking of asking to be relieved. The fact is that the conditions under which the Finance Department has been working during the last few months have been to say the least intolerable. It is all very well to say that the pressure is confined to a particular season. There is no longer any point in that; it is no longer the case. As soon as this budget is over the whole department will have to sit down and concentrate its attention on the inevitable arrears that are accumulated owing to its energies having had to be devoted almost solely to the budget. If I may say so there is a limit to which the Council can ask either the Secretaries of Government to become slave drivers or their subordinates to overwork. The conditions in the last few months have, I am sorry to say, been closely akin to slavery. So far as I know not one clerk, not one superintendent, not one assistant secretary has enjoyed either a Sunday, a last Saturday in the month or any other holiday. Whether there were gazetted holidays or not has become a

20th March 1922]

[Mr. T. E. Moir]

matter of entire indifference so far as these officers were concerned. The hon. Member who moved this motion possibly intends or expects to remain only an independent and irresponsible critic; but I would appeal to those who are more or hope to be more, is it good for the Reforms, for the administration, for the prospects of new lines of policy which may be laid down by this Council but can only be carried into effect by the hearty co-operation of the administrative services, that they should be driven to a state of sullen discontent by this continuous threat of more work and less pay coupled with the supreme and unwarranted insult ' for ye be idle '?"

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ I oppose this motion for the reduction of grant. I can bear testimony to what the hon. the Finance Secretary said as to the amount of work and the amount of straw which is required to bake a brick. For it is only to-day that I received a communication from him in answer to an enquiry I made on the 12th December as to the amount of salaries that were drawn by the various establishments in 1908–1909, 1918–19 and 1921–22. What was asked for on the 12th December they have had to prepare and finish only on the 18th of March in the midst of their multifarious duties. It shows these interesting figures of salaries and travelling allowances. In the year 1908 it was 395 lakhs; it rose to 524 lakhs in 1918–19 and in the current year it stands at 835 lakhs of rupees. It shows that while before the Reforms the levy was easier it has gone so high after that. The difference of 311 lakhs represents the price of the Reforms. So I do appreciate that they have a lot of work. Their services could be utilized in this way. Services of this kind should be rendered with much care. There is a good deal of work to be done and so we will not be justified in our policy in cutting down the salary of one assistant secretary. Under these circumstances I agree that there is a lot to be done, a lot of useful information they can give to enable ourselves to go about in such a manner that we can effect sound retrenchment.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—“ I wish to oppose this motion Sir. I have seen something of the extreme pressure under which the Financial Department is working. For the last two or three months particularly, the whole of the Finance Department from the Finance Member downwards (I had very many opportunities of seeing the work which was being done in this section of the Secretariat) has been working day and night. It is not surprising that under this pressure of work Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya, had to take leave for the purpose of taking rest. No doubt, it may be said and probably to some extent truly, that the pressure of work during the budget season is greater than the other seasons. But even making ample allowance for the extra pressure then, in other seasons also the pressure on the Financial section of the Secretariat is necessarily very heavy. The only amount that can be saved if this motion is carried is a comparatively paltry sum of Rs. 6,000. But the effect of the mistakes that are likely to be perpetrated in the absence of the necessary staff in the Finance Department is very great. For these reasons, Sir, I oppose this motion.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ The two assistant secretaries of the Finance Department are not engaged all the time in finance work. It is not generally known that the Finance Department is attending besides finance to other work also. An endeavour has been made to keep in the hands of the Finance Member all those things which do

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

not involve the spending of provincial money. He is not in charge of any spending department, but he has in his hands everything of a general nature and everything in which this Government is an agent for the Central Government. That includes such sections as reorganizations of establishments, record offices, questions relating to forms, the whole of stationery and printing,—the Finance Secretary is the head of the department in the case of the Government Press—archaeology, meteorology, income-tax, customs, marine, salt, posts and telegraphs, telephones and so on. The amount of work outside finance is quite sufficient to keep one assistant secretary employed all the year round though, as a matter of fact, we have to make him do some finance work as well. We really ought to have one assistant secretary for this work and another for finance work except in the budget season when we should have an additional man. I have already referred in my budget speech to the fact that, from about the 1st of October to the middle of November, we have been getting estimates from 75 heads of departments which have to be checked by the Accountant-General, the administrative departments, the Finance Department, the Finance Committee and the Cabinet. I think hon. Members will realize that from what my hon. Colleagues both in the reserved and transferred departments have said that the discussions on these estimates involve a very large amount of discussion between the Finance Department and the departments concerned. I think I have already mentioned the fact that our budget notes are printed in this little volume which runs up to 904 pages of printed matter."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know if the document which the hon. the Finance Member refers to has been placed on the table?" (Laughter.)

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I believe the hon. Member is not quoting from it but he is simply referring to it." (Laughter.)

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"In addition to all this we have greatly improved our budget procedure in the endeavour to avoid all lump allotments, probable savings and so forth and to put down exact figures wherever we possibly can. But all this means an enormous amount of work. If we are not correct in our adjustments, we shall have to come up often for supplementary grants. Meanwhile the Finance Committee meets frequently and we have to prepare elaborate notes for them. We have given them in all information covering over 80 pages of printed matter—80 pages of calculation, not simple, straightforward writing. Any decision of that committee means not an alteration under one single head but throughout the volumes so that the clerks concerned are engaged in keeping the alteration going on right through. When we get to the stage of bringing out the budget the work increases enormously and, as Mr. Moir has pointed out it was not until 3 a.m. of the morning of the day on which the budget was presented that it was ready. I was myself here till 11 o'clock on the previous night. I can assure the Council that we are not idling away our time or living an easy life. We really cannot carry on our work if one assistant secretary is taken away. If the Council wishes to press this, all that I can say is that I will have to evolve a simpler system of procedure which will involve in our having to decline to provide a great deal of the statistical information which is now asked for and provided."

20th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I have got one or two words to say in reply to Mr. Moir. We must take that those days when we were not properly answered and when we were asked to look for ourselves are now gone. Our European friends like Mr. Moir must realize this and there is no use of abuse and anger. Certainly the Finance Committee is an important committee and the members of that committee are naturally expected to know about the work that is being done in that department. Those of us who are not members of the committee have also to get the information. There is no use of anybody getting angry and saying, as in the case of discussion on allowances, that we know nothing and also their saying ‘ we know our business better than you know and whatever you may do, we know what to do ’.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ I venture to say, Sir, that with reference to the question of allowances, my attitude has not been that ‘ we refuse information, that Members know nothing ’. My attitude has been that I am willing to place before any hon. Member who will interest himself in the matter, every possible piece of information.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I am not speaking of the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter whose attitude is always conciliatory. I am referring to Mr. Moir’s speech with regard to the allowances.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ I do not remember having said anything about allowances.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I am referring to his speech in regard to duty allowances. Anyhow so far as the present thing is concerned, I only wanted to have information as to what these people were really doing. Making bricks with straw or without straw is a matter which has absolutely nothing to do in India where bricks are made without straw and I hope Mr. Moir will adopt a new policy of following the machinery where the brick is made without straw. Every member who is here realizes his own position and responsibility and needs no teaching at all. Coming to this motion, all I can say is that I wanted information about this matter; and all the members who have spoken seem to have forgotten what I said. I said that probably at the time of the budget there may be need even for another additional assistant secretary. All that I could gather from the previous speakers is that members of the staff will be put to a considerable strain during the budget season for three months.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“ That is not a correct interpretation of my statement, Sir. I said that the pressure did not cease with the budget season and after the budget season was over the Finance Department had to tackle the immense burden of work which had accumulated during that budget season and that it was no longer a question of heavy pressure at a certain period but a continued season of heavy pressure.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Whatever the interpretation may be, Sir, from what Mr. Moir said, I gather that somebody broke down during the finance season, that they sat till late in the night on the day previous to the presentation of the budget or that they had to work hard on the day next to that. All I want to say is that we are entitled to get informations. This is the only time when we can get information unless it is by way of questions when also we may be troubling the staff. After what has been stated by the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter that there is sufficient work for the

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [20th March 1922]

secretaries, we are satisfied with it. We are completely satisfied with his attitude. All that I say is 'we entered upon the new state of things last year. After one or two years' experience, can we not try to dispense with one or two hands?' I will be the last man, especially after what has been said about the mental worry and all that, to say that we must at once take away one officer. My attitude always has been that so far as people actually in the permanent service are concerned, we should not take them away at all. I know they are all doing very good work and are ably helping the heads of the department. I never said that they must be sent away. I only wanted to know if one of these officers—temporary officers—can be dispensed with at least for a portion of the year. I once more say that the attitude of the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter has been very conciliatory but not that of Mr. Moir. With this appeal that the matter may be carefully gone into, I withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 379.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I beg to make the following motion :—

379. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for a temporary additional assistant secretary for four months.*

"After what has been stated on the previous amendment, I wish to know, Sir, whether the temporary additional assistant secretary for four months is really a necessary thing and at what period of the year he is generally employed."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"The temporary assistant secretary is employed for the budget season. As to the question whether he is really necessary, I can only repeat what Mr. Moir was saying. During the budget season neither he nor anybody else has been enjoying any kind of holiday, not even Sunday and the clerks and the assistant secretaries have been driven morning, noon and night."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 380 to 382.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

380. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,080 for six temporary peons.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

381. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 120 for two temporary peons for four months for the temporary additional assistant secretary.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

382. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,198 for the temporary establishment.*

Motion 383.

Rao Bahadur C. VENKATA RANGA REDDI :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

383. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishment.*

20th March 1922] [Mr. C. Venkata Ranga Reddi]

“ I suppose this costly officer was appointed for the purpose of effecting economy and efficiency in all public offices. Mr. Tottenham was appointed not long ago for the same purpose. He formulated a scheme by which some clerks and some peons were sent home from the departments and, I believe, Sir, that he also submitted a report in which he made some suggestions for cutting some more establishment. I submit, Sir, that the heads of offices may be asked to send up proposals for this purpose, for the purpose for which this officer—Director of Office Systems—is appointed. The village establishment was reduced some time ago on the recommendation of the heads of offices. There was no officer appointed specially for this purpose and any number of village talaiyaris and village headmen were removed on the recommendation of the heads of offices. May I ask the hon. Member, Sir, what this special officer has done for these two or three months? I believe he was appointed two or three months back. May I know whether he has done anything during these two or three months? May I also ask whether this officer is drawing pension and whether he is being paid Rs. 1,500 a month in addition to his pension that he is already drawing? I submit this appointment is a costly luxury and this House will be well advised not to grant this demand at all. The heads of offices can without any difficulty send up proposals not only for reducing the establishment but also for minimising correspondence in their offices.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I am very glad that the hon. Member has given me an opportunity of answering a series of questions regarding what he is pleased to call this costly luxury. I should like to say before I go any further that so far from being a costly luxury this appointment is in a very large measure one of economy as I shall proceed to demonstrate presently. Now the hon. Member asks me whether Mr. Schmidt is paid Rs. 1,500 a month in addition to his pension. That is not so. His appointment costs the Government only Rs. 875 a month. The Rs. 1,500 put down in the budget includes his pension, so that I think we have made an uncommonly cheap bargain. In the next place I should like to say that the bargain was struck after very careful examination and scrutiny by the Finance Committee.

“ Now to come to the next point, the hon. Member asks me why heads of offices cannot do this work for themselves. My answer is that good office management is as much a science as surgery, or medicine or engineering, and that just as you cannot expect a good office manager to be a surgeon, you cannot expect a good surgeon to be an office manager. You cannot expect heads of technical departments to look after the management of their offices as efficiently as a special officer. In this connexion I should like to read a portion of the report of the committee which was appointed by the Government of India on office procedure in which they recommended the creation of a similar appointment at Simla. They say in paragraph 139—

‘ As we have already indicated we attach great importance to the appointment of an officer of suitable experience and standing as Inspector of office procedure. The post should either be a permanent one or should be continued for at least ten years. The Inspector should, we consider, be attached for administrative purposes to the Home Department, but he should be given as independent a status as possible, and should have as free access to the various departments and offices as has been accorded to this committee. If such an appointment be made, it will be possible, without risk of undue delay, to discriminate between those changes of office procedure which can and should be universally and immediately introduced and those which from their nature can only be gradually adopted owing to their dependence on other alterations of conditions which are still in the future, or which for various reasons can best be introduced gradually in one department at a time rather than simultaneously throughout the Government of India.’

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[20th March 1922]

“ They go on to say that they would not trust even the heads of the Government of India Secretariat to carry out the changes in an important matter like this without the help of the special officer.

“ Now, Sir, I have been asked what this gentleman has done during the short time that he has been employed. The first office that he took up was the office of the Surgeon-General. He went there because there was an urgent request for increase of staff, and as a result of his enquiry he was able to show that not only there was no need for any increase but that the staff could be reduced by Rs. 3,528 per annum. On the top of that I am credibly informed that the Surgeon-General says that since he put his office in order, he has now saved two hours a day. In other words there was a highly paid technical officer spending his time on routine because he was not trained in office procedure; but he is now able to devote his time to the administration of his department because his office has been put into good working order.

“ In the Secretariat a saving of at least Rs. 3,000 per annum is indicated by a rearrangement of the central record branch which is going on now in the barracks which has been handed over to us by the military department. There has also been a saving of another Rs. 3,000 per annum by instituting a central stationery and cash department instead of having each department managing their things for itself. He has also made proposals for reducing the staff employed for conservancy and for watching the buildings. He hopes to make much reduction in the stationery use, to reduce the amount of printing by cutting out the unnecessary matter and in other ways, especially by the institution of a central despatch bureau. I might explain this as follows: When a general order goes down to all offices in the revenue department, the present practice is to send a large number of copies to the Board of Revenue, who send them to the collectors, thence to the divisional officers and thence to the tahsildars, so that the same paper goes in half a dozen covers one after another and it is forwarded by slow degrees until it reaches the last destination. What we are trying to do is—it is not at all an easy thing—to arrange a great despatch bureau from which all the printed matter will go straight into the pigeon hole of the ultimate addresses and will be despatched direct to the individual concerned once a week so that all the distribution through the various offices is avoided. This means a saving of stamp and paper and of the cost of maintaining despatching clerks all the way through.

“ Another piece of work which the Director of Office Systems has in hand is the collection of books and rearrangement of the library books in all the secretariat libraries. We have a great many valuable books which, owing to want of proper arrangement, we do not properly appreciate; all the principal libraries in the headquarter offices will be overhauled by him, duplicates will be got rid of and the pick of the selection will become the nucleus of the Council library which we hope to have ready for hon. Members by the next August.

“ Another important piece of work which Mr. Schmidt is taking in hand in consultation with the Consulting Architects to Government is the re-distribution of Government offices. In a time of financial stringency, we have got to make the most of all our assets in brick and mortar. If we leave heads of offices or clerks to attend to this work, we will find that each

20th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

individual will get as much benefit for himself as possible. That is why we want a central authority who will go round and see that the utmost possible value is got out of every square foot of building. These officers are taking that work in hand.

“Finally I would remind the Council that for every saving of Rs. 100, the capitalised value is Rs. 18,000. In order that the Council may be satisfied that his various economy schemes are not schemes of expenditure, Mr. Schmidt is keeping an account by double entry in which he will show us every half-year what his appointment has cost us and the value of the savings effected by him. I can promise the Council that if we find that instead of saving he is costing us money, we will very soon put a stop to his appointment.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I am free to confess that I was one of those who thought that the appointment of Director of Office systems was a superfluous one. But now after hearing the hon. the Finance Member, I have changed my view in the matter. It appears from what he has stated that in several offices, there is a duplication of work. There is plenty of work which can be saved and I think the officer who has been appointed specially for this work has been going about doing the work in the right fashion and has so far effected considerable economy. Inasmuch as the heads of departments are not well versed in the details of departmental management, do not know much about the nature of routine work and have neither the time nor the mental equipment to examine and find out how economy might be effected, I think it necessary that we must depute a person who has considerable experience of the details of office management and knows exactly whether a particular piece of work is superfluous or whether a particular clerk is unnecessary, to go into the whole question. I think an appointment like that of the Director of Office Systems is a desirable one and perhaps we will have to continue him for several years or until such time as he finishes his work. I therefore think that my hon. friend Mr. Venkata Ranga Reddi will be well advised in not pressing his motion. My hon. Friend will notice that the officer has done some substantial work and there seems to be every promise of his doing even more useful work hereafter.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 384 and 385.

The following motions were not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

384. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishment.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

385. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 21,800 for Director of Office Systems and establishments.*

Motion 386.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

386. *To omit the allotment Rs. 9,300 for one Under Secretary.*

[Mr. Sasi Bhushana Rath]

[20th March 1922]

"Sir, the Development Department is a yet to develop or an infant department and I think an Under Secretary and so many others that have been appointed are not necessary now. The Education Minister might require all these people and the Minister for Local Self-Government might require all these officers to help him, but surely there is no need for the Development Minister to have so many hands to help him. I therefore desire that this allotment be omitted. I think this department cannot utilise the full working capacity of the three people, the Secretary, Assistant Secretary and the Under Secretary."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"I suppose the hon. Member is committing a mistake in referring to the Assistant Secretary. The motion is only to omit the allotment for one Under Secretary."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—"I have said that he has got an Assistant Secretary and therein I am, I think, quite in order.

"Under the circumstances mentioned by me, I think the Minister does not need an Under Secretary. If the hon. the Minister for Development should think it absolutely necessary, then I will not grudge his retaining the officer."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"Sir, considering that the Development Department as he put it, is yet in the early stages, there must be an impression abroad that there is not enough work for the Under Secretary and the Secretary in that department. But let me assure the House that there is enough and more than enough work for these officers. It may be that the number of files that come to me may not be as great as the number that reaches my hon. Colleagues. Hon. Members of this House will remember that there is a great difference between this department and the other departments. Whereas the other departments have got precedents, being old departments, with practical experience behind them, we find everything new in this department. We have no codes, we have no manuals, we have no rules, we have no regulations and we have no precedents to fall back upon and the result is that whenever a question arises, we have to hunt up for precedents in foreign countries. We have to read a good deal, we have to digest a good deal, in fact we have to cut our path across virgin soil and make our way through. I think these officers have got more work than they can possibly do. I will just mention a few of the duties discharged by them. The Under Secretary is in charge of forests, cinchona, agriculture, co-operation and veterinary. I may mention for the information of hon. Members that forests and cinchona are in charge of the hon. the Home Member; the other departments are in my charge. The Assistant Secretary is in charge of fisheries, industries, factories, mines and minerals, trade, etc. Thus it will be seen that the secretaries of the Development Department have got to deal with five members of the Government. In agriculture and industries, they look to me, for fisheries and cinchona they look to the Leader of this House, for trade they look to the hon. the Finance Member, for factories they look to the hon. the Law Member and for mines and minerals they look to the hon. Member to my left. The result is that these three officers have got to attend to the work of 5 members of Government. It will be noticed that no other secretaries are obliged to work for so many members. There are a number of Superintendents in the other Secretariats; but in the Development Secretariat there is only one Superintendent and the Under Secretary

20th March 1922] [Mr. K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu]

works without even a Superintendent. Besides normal work they have to do a good deal of work by way of collecting statistical information. Hon. Members who have had occasion to see the information that we furnished to the Fiscal Commission when it arrived here will remember that the Commission was so well satisfied with the information supplied by this Government in my evidence that they openly recognized the services which this Government had rendered in furnishing them information the like of which they had not got anywhere else. Now, Sir, if any credit can be taken for it, here is a volume of printed matter containing 100 pages, the major part of which was produced by the office in addition to their regular office work. And it is the Secretary and Under Secretaries that controlled the

work. I am perfectly willing to place it on the table, and
4-45 p.m. my hon. Friend can see what amount of work it involved;

and I say that this work has been done in addition to their other official work. Many hours corresponding to what others enjoy as leisure were spent by them either at the office or at my house out of office hours. To say that these officers have no work is injustice to a hard-worked and earnest set of officials."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I wish that the hon. the Minister for Development had justified his statement that all the three secretaries had more work than they could cope with by a reference to the statistics. Here is the budget from which we can have accurate information regarding the work in his and other departments. Take for example the Local Self-Government Department. There are five Superintendents and 35 clerks, whereas in the office of the Development Department there are only two Superintendents and 17 clerks. These Secretaries are placed to supervise the work of the establishment under them. Sir, a comparison of the work of the Development Department with that of the Local Self-Government Department will show that the work there is more or less half of that of the Local Self-Government Department. When that is so, is it justifiable, I ask, that he should have the same number of secretaries as the Local Self-Government Minister finds it necessary to have? I believe it was managed with a less number of secretaries last year. I think no case has been made out for the increase this year."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—"These officers have been working under me from the time I took charge of the portfolio, Sir."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"Even then it is an unnecessary item of expenditure. The present question, simple as it appears to be, would show what the policy of the Ministers is, whether they would content themselves with just the number of secretaries necessary for their work or whether they want the luxury of a superfluous staff, simply because it exists elsewhere.

"The amount of work done in an office can be gauged to some extent, by a reference to the work of the typists in the office. In the Local Self-Government Department they require six typists and in the Development Department three are found to be enough. The hon. Minister referred to the number of subjects dealt with by the secretaries. I am concerned with what work they do in regard to each of them. We all know how these things may be made to look on paper, though really the work done is precious little. The number

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [20th March 1922]

of files disposed of in respect of each subject may have been only two or three and yet to the uninitiated they may be made to appear to be a prodigious amount of work. The present motion is really a test as to how far the Ministers are willing to reduce expenditure when it is possible for them to do so."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I enter into this discussion by reason of the fact that the duties of the secretariat staff concerned involve also Forest and Cinchona. I may premise in the first instance that both Forest and possibly also Cinchona are expanding departments. The fact that the House has now, in dealing with the demand for forests, committed itself to a policy of development and exploitation means, I am certain, more work in the Development branch of the Secretariat. In regard to Cinchona there was until recently the possibility that the whole department would definitely be made over to the Government of India. It is a matter for regret to me that this policy of transfer has been frustrated. There are many reasons why the control of the cinchona plantation and the manufacture and sale of quinine should be in the hands of the Central Government and not controlled by Provincial Governments. However, it is no use repining. The Government of India have decided that the change in system which we in Madras advocated should not take place. It follows that the future of the Cinchona Department will, so far as the Secretariat work is concerned, rest with the Development branch and I may tell those who are interested in the matter that there are troublous times ahead. Very large issues have been kept in abeyance pending the settlement of the agency responsible for the department. One of these issues is whether or not there should be a substantial expansion of the operations for planting cinchona trees; and the examination and settlement of this question will inevitably entail hard work on the Secretariat.

“ Sir, that brings me to a further point—a point which, I think, practically answers the line of criticism put forward by Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. I have said that these cinchona problems will involve hard work in the Secretariat and that developments under forests will also involve much work. Now in both these cases the work is of a class which cannot effectively be dealt with only by subordinate clerks and which must engage the close attention of men of a much higher calibre. In this respect the case differs materially from that of the Local Self-Government Department. I was Assistant Secretary many years ago in that department and later on I held the post of Secretary for nearly three years. The class of work, as I can confidently tell the House which comes to the Local Self-Government Department, includes a mass of routine. Items in regard to which the formal sanction of the Government or reference to Government is necessary come from—I do not know how many municipal councils and district boards. It was a large number in my time, but it is now considerably higher than when I was Secretary. For routine work of this kind the multiplicity of references demands a multiplicity of clerks, but the supervision of such work does not require a large staff of under secretaries and assistant secretaries. On the other hand the class of work which comes to the Development Department is different; there is comparatively little routine matter and the papers that come up involve a certain amount of hard mental labour. It is necessary therefore that the superior staff should be manned by persons who are of a calibre fit to deal with it. Much of the work which comes to the Under Secretary

20th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

Mr. Nageswara Rao, demands intelligence of a high order and I should be very sorry to see him replaced by a less efficient officer."

Sriman Biswanatha Das moved the closure which was carried.

The main motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It may be convenient if I now inform the House that precisely at 5-30 the motions that have not been moved will lapse and the demand for the grant will be put."

Motions 387 to 392.

The following motions were not made:—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

387. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,400 for one assistant secretary.*

388. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 320 for leave allowance of one assistant secretary.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI:—

389. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for assistant secretary.*

Sriman SAST BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—

390. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for clerks in the establishment of the registrar of panchayats, etc., by Rs. 1,200.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—

391. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,12,470 for local fund audit establishments by Rs. 100.*

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—

392. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,33,960 for secretariat and headquarters establishments by Rs. 100.*

Motion 393.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

393. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,33,960 for secretariat and head-quarter establishments by Rs. 1 lakh.*

"No reduction has been made by this House in all the previous details of General Administration, probably with a view to freely use its hands when considering this particular item. You will see from the budget for 1921-22 an allotment of Rs. 8,77,900 was provided for this item last year. This year the item is Rs. 9,39,200 of which the votable amount is Rs. 6,33,960. The difference will thus be Rs. 61,300 in excess of what was provided for in the last year's budget. The hon. the Finance Member when he presented the budget was good enough to tell us that a principle of 20 per cent reduction has been adopted in the various departments. In the Finance, the Revenue, the Development and Local Self-Government Secretariats, you will find that the aggregate is in excess of last year's expenditure by Rs. 61,300. We expected that the heads of departments in the Secretariat would set an example to the district officers to follow, namely, a reduction of 20 per cent. It is not found to be the case now.

[Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya] [20th March 1922]

Moreover, in the course of the debate this morning we have come to the conclusion that the Legislative Council will meet hereafter once in every two months. This will remove a great strain on the Secretariat. This is one of the grounds on which the members should vote for this reduction.

“ We have noticed, Sir, that the members of the Government have been

5 p.m. working strenuously without the assistance of some of the secretaries. The assistant secretaries and the under secretaries

establishment under the Ministers have been working in their own departments. I think even there you could get on to a certain extent without the assistance of some of those secretaries. Having preached to others that they should cut the expenditure in various districts, I think that it is necessary for the heads of the departments to set an example. The hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell us that he used the pruning knife to the extent that it could go. But when he wanted to apply the pruning knife to the branches under his own supervision, I think, he roused up a nest of hornets which began to fly at his face and sting him, and he seemed to be afraid to cut a portion of the expenditure there. And then, if this is worked out it amounts only to 16 per cent reduction, whereas the hon. the Finance Member was pleased to tell others to reduce the expenditure by 20 per cent. But here my figure works out only to 16 per cent reduction. I think, we might doubtless lay our hands on the aggregate amount of six lakhs and odd and reduce it by one lakh.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“ Sir, I protest against this practice of first attacking the budget in detail, picking out a number of items which hon. Members wish to have reduced and when they are satisfied that there was nothing that can be cut out under these heads of saying ‘ Very well, we have found we cannot make any reduction ourselves; therefore we make a lump reduction and leave it to you to settle the details’. My reply to that attitude is this:—If there is anything superfluous in the budget, cut it out, but don’t come to us and say we are going to make a lump reduction and give you discretion to settle the details. It is impossible to accept a resolution of that sort.

“ Again, as regards the matter of the reduction by 20 per cent, I should like again to make it clear that we did not tell the departments that they were immediately to cut down the cost of their administration by 20 per cent. We could not do that. As I said in my opening speech, we could not tell the doctors to close their hospitals or the schoolmasters to close the schools. As I have said many a time before, what we did was this: We asked the heads of the departments what they would do without if they had to cut down their administration by 20 per cent. We got a reply from the Surgeon-General, for instance, to say that that would involve closing the hospitals or making the patients pay for their diet. This we discussed in the Finance Committee when we came to the conclusion that it was impossible in this case to reduce the expenditure by anything like 20 per cent.

“ The hon. Member has referred to my pruning knife, and in a very uncomplimentary way has compared my hon. Colleagues to a nest of hornets. I think the metaphor should be dealt with in another way. We may take the States as a tree, with roots, stem and branches. I put it to the Council that the roots of the tree are the departments that suck in the nourishment, the Land Revenue and Excise. The stem of the tree is the portion

20th March 1922] [Sir Charles Todhunter]

which holds up the rest, viz., law and order and the general administration. The branches and leaves are the transferred subjects, the young growth that make a great show. Now, when you want to prune a tree, what do you prune first? I take it that the first thing that you prune is the youngest growth. It may be necessary in rare cases to prune the roots, but that is a very drastic step to take. The one thing you never prune is the stem. If you do that, you cut the life out of the tree.

“Then, Sir, he has told us that this Council is going to meet hereafter once in two months. I confess that is the first, I have heard of the scheme. My own fear is that the Council will be in perpetual session when we really get going with the big Bills that we have in hand. Finally, I should like to remind him that not a little of the work, of the Secretariat office which he wishes to prune so drastically is due to the Council. If he is going to cut great pieces out of the Secretariat, all I can say is the reply, which unfortunately sometimes has to be given to questions, namely, that the Government are not in possession of the information asked for will have to be given in a great many more cases than is at present the case.”

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—“I never expected that the tender branches would be aimed at by the hon. the Finance Member. I expected that the superfluous growths would be cut off first. But from the explanation of the hon. the Finance Member, I find it is impossible to reduce the grant any more. Therefore I beg to withdraw the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 394.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

394. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 12,50,000 for Secretariat and head-quarter establishments by Rs. 100.*

Motion 395.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

395. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 28,100 for salary of Publicity officer by Rs. 16,100.”*

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“I rise to a point of order. This sum of Rs. 16,100 appears to include a portion of a non-votable item.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The hon. Mr. K. Gopalakrishnayya would notice that the sum of Rs. 28,100 comprises a sum of Rs. 24,600 which is non-votable and a sum of Rs. 1,500 plus Rs. 2,000 or Rs. 3,500 which is votable. It is obvious that a motion to cut off Rs. 16,100, while the available amount for being cut off is Rs. 3,500, is out of order. Therefore, I must rule out his motion.”

The motion was accordingly ruled out of order.

Motion 396.

Rao Bahadur P. C. ETIRAJULU NAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

396. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

[Mr. P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu]

[20th March 1922]

“Sir, it is a well-known fact that this department is consuming a very large amount of money compared with the work turned out. So far as we are able to see, no doubt this department is serving in a way a useful purpose by compiling information received from the mufassal and distributing it to various people. But this Bureau has issued nothing special what we may call original. The Management spends also a large amount under ‘other contingencies.’ I do not see why such a large amount under ‘other contingencies’ should have been noted there. My real idea in moving this motion is to make the Publicity Board run with a cheaper agency.

“I shall just show how this department spends their money. I have with me a publication, Sir, regarding the Madras X-ray Institute newly opened in the General Hospital. This book is printed by the Government Press for the Publicity Bureau. Here, Sir, this House can see what a grand brochure this book is worthy of being presented to His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It is brought forward by the Publicity Bureau. Surely it contains useful information, but it does not require such a costly publication as this. That is why I say a lot of curtailment in expenditure from top to bottom is required. With this idea I move this motion.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“Sir, hon. Members have, I think, received copies of the Administration report of the Publicity Bureau, and if they have read that document they will have seen that the hon. Member is not correct in saying that the idea of the Publicity Bureau is to compile information received from up-country. The work of the Bureau has been fully explained there. It was fully discussed in this Council last year, as well as in the Imperial Council, and I do not think I need go into details again, but I shall be very glad to do, if any hon. Member wishes it.

“The hon. the Mover says that there is nothing original about the work of the Bureau. I think he would not hold that opinion if he had seen some of the communications that I have received on it. Not long ago I had an application from a printer and publisher for permission to publish publicity leaflets in book form on his own responsibility because he regarded it as very valuable matter. Here, again, I have an extract from the Journal of the Travancore Teachers’ Association:—

‘No review of recent educational work in the country can omit to notice, even briefly, the extent and value of the adult educational work which is being done by the Publicity agencies of the Government of India and the provincial administrations. The work done by the Madras Bureau deserves honourable mention. Some idea of it may be obtained by the one fact, that 16,000 leaflets were issued during the short period of twelve months.’

“Even in their speeches this morning several hon. Members have referred to the volume of good work turned out by the Publicity Bureau.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I complimented even. I spoke in favour of it last year.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“As for the appointment of a cheaper officer, all I can say is that Publicity officers are born and not made. I think the House will agree that in the two officers we have had hitherto, we have been exceptionally fortunate. For a successor to Dr. Gilbert Slater we are seeking for the best possible man. Whether official or non-official, whether European or Indian, whether high paid or low paid, we want a man who has really the qualifications for the post. The question of the appointment has been held specifically in abeyance until we are in

20th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

possession of the views of this House upon the point. The matter will be taken up by His Excellency as soon as this debate is over. I was surprised to hear that the little pamphlet which is being circulated on the X-ray institution was too good for this House. I am sure nothing is too good for this House.—(laughter). On the other hand, we have received constant complaints from the Publicity officer representing his Board to the effect that we are insisting upon his using too cheap a type of paper, which is really depreciating the value of the work of the authors which we are sending round.

“As regards the ‘other contingencies’ which has been criticized, that is mainly for packing cases, paper, increased postal charges, and so forth, and I can assure the hon. Member that no money is wasted in this direction. Lastly, in case of any misconception, I would say that the leaflets are the production of the Bureau as a whole, of an entirely non-official body with a non-official chairman, and that it is not our desire to use this for propaganda, but to use it for educational work and make it as far as possible representative of all bodies of men.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—“Mr. President, I would like to support the motion for reduction. My hon. Friend the Finance Member told us that Publicity Officers are born and not made like poets who shine with innate glory. I wonder what these people were doing before they were appointed to this office in order to realize or exhibit the irresistible impulse attributed to them. I entirely agree that a certain amount of journalistic experience is part of the qualifications of a Publicity Officer, but I deny that it is essential to appoint such highly-paid officers for this purpose. I have myself been the recipient regularly of most of the publications of this Bureau, and I do not for one moment deny that these publications are of value. The real question is whether similar publications cannot be had at a smaller expense. I have had leaflets sent to me which might properly have been sent by the agricultural or industrial department. Anyhow, no case has been made out for having this central clearing House for information. Sir, the Publicity Bureau has also been used to some extent for the purpose of propaganda. I have no objection to this as such, but I think that any propaganda organized by the Government would not have the same effect upon the people as propaganda organized under non-official auspices. Apart from these things I certainly think that the Bureau can be run on a much more economical basis. Much money is being spent upon this and if you work out the cost of these pamphlets or leaflets, taking the entire cost of the establishment into consideration, you will find the figure to be so high that no businessman would for one moment tolerate. I therefore feel strongly that the reduction now proposed is necessary, and if there is to be a reorganization of the department by which a less expensive head could be secured for it and one good enough for the purpose though not as good as the one referred to by my hon. Friend it will serve all useful purposes.”

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—“I have also given notice of a motion to reduce the total demand by Rs. 20,000. I must say that I am a member of the Publicity Bureau. Still, Sir, I make this motion for this reason: that though the work done by the Publicity Bureau has

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai]

[20th March 1922]

some good points, yet I do believe, Sir, that in order to carry on the work which is now being done by the Publicity Bureau, a highly-paid official carrying a salary of Rs. 2,000 and odd is quite unnecessary. I submit that the hon. the Finance Member referred to the administration report issued by the Publicity Bureau. I was very sorry for that reference because the administration report by itself is not anything about which one could say a word of praise. I am afraid it is a thing which tells against the Publicity Bureau, for you will see that a good portion of the amount allotted for the Publicity Bureau is spent upon salaries and establishments, and for issuing leaflets. Out of Rs. 38,000 and odd spent for the issuing of leaflets, Rs. 7,000 go for the leaflets and the balance for postage and other things. I do not believe, Sir, that it is necessary to have a costly establishment for these things. We do not want the Publicity Bureau to go out entirely but we would like the Publicity Bureau to be remodelled as in other countries. With these words, I support the motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—"I also wish to give my support to this motion. It is unnecessary to take up the time of the Council for any length of time in dealing with this matter in view of the discussion we had last year. We are somewhat handicapped in a consideration of this question owing to the decision of the Governor to keep the post of Publicity Officer under non-votable items, even though he is not a member of Indian Civil Service. I only mention this—of course I cannot question the ruling—to show that this is the difficulty that arises in a discussion of this question after the decision to keep that item as 'non-votable'. The acceptance of this motion indicates the view of the House that it is highly undesirable to have an officer with such a high pay as Rs. 2,000 and odd. It is impossible to believe that there is no Indian in this place who has got journalistic taste and journalistic ability and who would draw a lower pay and do the work in a satisfactory manner. We cannot therefore afford to continue the appointment on such a lavish and extravagant scale. We shall therefore reduce the amount."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I also support this motion for reduction by Rs. 20,000. I was one of those who supported the maintenance of this institution last year, and we have seen its working during the year. The hon. the Finance Member has placed the Publicity Officer along with the poet. I only hope that the wares which are issued out of his office by the Publicity Officer are not manufactured in imagination as the poet's are. However that may be, my point is not that there should not be any Publicity Officer, but the question is whether the agency cannot be carried on on much cheaper lines, and whether it is necessary to pay Rs. 2,000 to the head of that office. Of course we may be reminded that it is a non-votable item. I am not therefore asking to reduce the pay of the Publicity Officer in this Council. But I do say that we shall cut out a portion of the allotment so that other means be devised for running the agency on cheaper lines. Sir, we can run it on much cheaper lines with an officer assisted by a board of honorary workers receiving a small allowance.

"Moreover, as has been pointed out the information which is issued by this department is sometimes very belated, whereas the press

20th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

communiqués which the Government is issuing on important political subjects come out very promptly and the credit is due to the Government Press rather than to the Publicity Office. Under these circumstances, though we are inclined to continue the Publicity Office for some time, we do desire that it shall be run on more cheaper and economical lines and with this purpose I support it."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I also have received a copy of the administration report of the Publicity Office and the one feature of it which particularly strikes me is the reference to the work done on the initiative of that body for the contradiction and exposure of innumerable false and misleading statements which are being issued in pursuance of the non-co-operation agitation. I agree with Mr. Ramalinga Reddi as to the greater value in the popular eye of counter-propaganda coming from private sources and not directly inspired or directed by Government. I recognize that this is the case, but the great difficulty of Government is that very little of such assistance is in fact forthcoming. All the more gratefully therefore do I acknowledge the measure of assistance given to the Government by the Publicity Bureau in this matter. The news slips come from Government and are given to the Publicity Board for dissemination, but the Board often makes this material much more effective by turning it into good colloquial vernacular. For the leaflets, the Board is directly responsible and the number issued on its authority has been large. In my judgment they have been of great value in combating the more violent features of the non-co-operation movement. The administration report gives a long list of leaflets on various subjects and I should be very sorry if in the coming year there were any falling off in their number or still more in their quality. It is an exceedingly difficult matter to draw up a really effective leaflet and in the name of economy to cut short the provision for the salary of the gentleman who has to do this work is much to be regretted. I know he has the assistance of a large Publicity Board but in business of this description it is of very little use to rely on any committee for sustained and continuous work. The driving power must come from a single officer even though he has the assistance and co-operation of a Board, and you cannot, Sir, spend too great care in selecting an officer who really is competent for such a matter. We were most fortunate in the selection of Mr. Gwynn, almost equally fortunate in securing the services of Dr. Slater. If the total provision under this head is cut down it will, I fear, handicap His Excellency in making a right and wise choice. I do not wish to deprive the Finance Member of his right of dealing more fully with the financial aspects of the question, and therefore sit down, again gratefully acknowledging the assistance which the Government have received from the action taken on the initiative of the Publicity Board and the Publicity Officer in regard to the non-co-operation movement."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"In view of the proposition that the cost is such that no business man would tolerate for a moment, I will only ask whether there are not some very able businessmen on the Publicity Board."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I move that the question be put."

[20th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I have to call upon the other hon. Members who have tabled the same motion.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ But there is the danger of 5-30 passing, Sir. That is why I proposed that the question be now put.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I am not aware of that danger.”

Mr. W. VIJAYAKRAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—“ I do not propose to make any speech beyond saying that the proposed reduction would help us much in the matter of retrenchment.”

The motion for the closure was put and carried.

5-30 p.m. The main motion was then put to the House and a poll taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.	25. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishna Nayar.
2. Dr. M. Appala Narasayya Nayudu.	26. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu
3. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar.	27. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.
4. Rai Bahadur P. C. Etirajulu Nayudu.	28. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayyo.
5. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.	29. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.
6. Sir P. Vyagaraya Chettiyar.	30. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
7. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.	31. Mr. Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayyo.
8. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.	32. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
9. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar.	33. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai.
10. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi.	34. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.
11. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar.	35. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.
12. Mr. W. Vijayakraghava Mudaliyar.	36. Mr. M. Ratnaswami.
13. Mr. K. P. Gopal Menon.	37. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.
14. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.	38. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.
15. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.	39. Mr. Abbas Ali Khan.
16. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai.	40. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.
17. Rao Sahib A. Kamayya Punja.	41. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib.
18. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi.	42. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib.
19. Mr. T. Somasundara Mudaliyar.	43. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur.
20. Mr. A. Subbarayudu.	44. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
21. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayananamurti Nayudu.	45. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya,
22. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.	
23. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi.	
24. Diwan Bahadur M. Venkataratnam Nayudu.	

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.	9. Mr. F. J. Richards.
2. ” ” Sir Charles Todhunter.	10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.
3. ” ” Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	11. Mr. R. Littlebailes.
4. ” ” Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	12. Mr. E. Periyanayagam.
5. ” ” Mr. P. Rama Narayananagar.	13. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
6. ” ” Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.	14. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.
7. ” ” Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.	15. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari.
8. Mr. T. E. Moir.	16. Mr. A. T. Palmer.
	17. Mr. M. C. Raja.

The motion was carried, 45 voting for it and 17 against.

Motions 397 to 407.

The following motions lapsed with the expiry of the time limit :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

397. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.

20th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

398. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

399. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 10,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

400. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

Mr. W. VIJAYARAGHAVA MUDALIYAR :—

401. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

Mr. K. PRABHAKARAN TAMPA :—

402. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

403. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Rs. 20,000.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

404. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board by Re. 1.*

Mr. T. SOMASUNDARA MUDALIYAR :—

405. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board.*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

406. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 53,400 for Publicity Board.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

407. *To reduce the allotment of 13.26 lakhs under Demand IX by 53 lakh.*

The demand for grant subject to the reduction of Rs. 20,000 in regard to the Publicity Bureau was then put to the House and carried. The grant of Rs. 13.26 lakhs minus Rs. 20,000, or Rs. 13.06 lakhs under IX. General Administration, Secretariat, etc., was made.

The House then adjourned at 5-35 p.m. to meet again at 11 a.m. on Tuesday the 21st March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.